

SEWARD PENINSULA
FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
ADVISORY COUNCIL

Taken at:
Aurora Inn & Suites
Nome, Alaska

September 25, 2001

ATTENDANCE

Council Members Present:

Grace Cross, Chair
Johnson Eningowuk
Frances A. Degnan
Peter G. Buck
Elmer K. Seetot, Jr.
Toby M. Anungazuk, Jr.
Perry T. Mendenhall

Coordinator:

Ann Wilkinson

Others Present:

Tim Jennings, US FWS; Carl Jack, BIA/US FWS;
Pat McClenahan, US FWS; Bill Knauer, US FWS;
Jim Magdanz, ADF&G; Richard Uberuaga, US
FWS; Stephen Fried, US FWS; Ken Adkisson,
NPS; Warren Eastland, BIA; Jeff Denton, BLM;
Austin Ahmasuk, Kawerak; Fred DeCicco,
ADF&G; Rose Fosdick, Kawerak; Dave Parker,
BLM; Jeanie Cole, BLM; Charles Lean, NPS;
Carl Jack, OSM; Kate Persons, ADF&G; Dave
Spirtes, NPS; Julia Arrotti, KNOM; Dave
Angungazak, Wales; Clyde Angungazak, Wales;
Norman Menadalook, Teller; Willie Kugzonuk,
Teller.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. CROSS: Hello. Good morning.
I would call the meeting to order of the
3 Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional
Advisory Council at 8:45.

4 If you would start, It's been a
hard week for everybody. We were supposed
5 to have had our meeting on September --
earlier part of September; but because of
6 the unfortunate incidents in our world, we
had to postpone our meeting to here. So
7 before we get started, I would like us to
have a moment of silence for our country and
8 for all those people that were affected by
what happened on September 11th.

9
(Moment of silence.)

10
MS. CROSS: Okay. Going down the
11 agenda, the roll call, please, Frances.

12 MS. DEGNAN: Johnson Eningowuk?

13 MR. ENINGOWUK: Here.

14 MS. DEGNAN: Grace Cross?

15 MS. CROSS: Here.

16 MS. DEGNAN: Leonard Kobuk?

17 MR. KOBUK: Here.

18 MS. DEGNAN: Peter Buck?

19 MR. BUCK: Here.

20 MS. DEGNAN: Elmer Seetot, Jr.?

21 MR. SEETOT: Here.

22 MS. DEGNAN: Toby Anungazuk, Jr.?

23 MR. ANUNGAZUK: Here.

24 MS. DEGNAN: Isaac Okleasik?
Perry Mendenhall?

25 MR. MENDENHALL: Here.

1 MS. DEGNAN: Daniel Olanna?
2
3 MS. CROSS: Excused.
4 MS. DEGNAN: Frances Degnan,
5 present.
6 We have a quorum.
7 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Frances.
8 I'm glad that we finally have things
9 together to do our meeting. I'm glad we are
10 all here.
11 We'll start with Leonard.
12 MR. KOBUK: I'm Leonard Kobuk. I
13 represent St. Michael and Stebbins.
14 MR. SEETOT: Elmer Seetot, Jr.,
15 Brevig Mission.
16 MS. DEGNAN: Frances Degnan,
17 Unalakleet.
18 MS. CROSS: Grace Cross, Nome.
19 MR. ENINGOWUK: Johnson
20 Eningowuk, Nome.
21 MR. ANUNGAZUK: Toby Anungazuk,
22 Wales.
23 MR. MENDENHALL: Perry
24 Mendenhall, Nome.
25 MR. BUCK: Peter Buck, White
Mountain.
MS. WILKINSON: Ann Wilkinson,
regional coordinator.
MS. FOSDICK: Rose Fosdick,
Kawerak.
MS. McCLENAHAN: I'm Pat
McClenahan, your regional anthropologist.
MR. PARKER: Dave Parker, BLM.
MR. MAGDANZ: Dave Magdanz,
ADF&G.

1 MS. PERSONS: Kate Persons,
2 wildlife biologist.

3 MR. FRIED: Steve Fried,
4 biologist with subsistence management in
Anchorage.

5 MR. UBERUAGA: Richard Uberuaga,
6 office of subsistence management.

7 MS. COLE: Jeanie Cole, wildlife
biologist, BLM.

8 MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton,
9 Anchorage office, subsistence.

10 MR. LEAN: Charlie Lean, National
Parks Service in Nome.

11 MR. TOKNAP: Fred Toknap, Nome.

12 MS. DEWHURST: Donna Dewhurst,
13 wildlife biologist, subsistence.

14 MR. JACK: Carl Jack, Native
liaison, OSM.

15 MR. JENNINGS: Tim Jennings. I'm
16 with the office of subsistence management in
Anchorage. I'm a division chief.

17 MR. KNAUER: Bill Knauer, office
18 of subsistence management, policy and
regulation.

19 MR. EASTLAND: Warren Eastland,
20 wildlife biologist with the BIA.

21 MR. AHMASUK: Austin Ahmasuk,
subsistence from Kawerak.

22 MR. DAVE ANUNGAZUK: Dave
23 Anungazuk.

24 MR. CLYDE ANUNGAZUK: Clyde
Anungazuk.

25 MS. MIEROP: Sandi Mierop, court
reporter.

1 MS. CROSS: Welcome to all of
2 you.

3 Now we'll review and adopt the
4 agenda.

5 There's been changes in the
6 agenda, I'll have Ann explain that.

7 MS. WILKINSON: Well, Bill
8 Knauer, who is scheduled to give his report
9 regarding halibut, will have to leave after
10 today; so we need to move his up, possibly
11 after we do the fisheries proposal.

12 MS. CROSS: So, after the
13 fisheries proposal, is that where you want
14 him?

15 MS. WILKINSON: Does that sound
16 fine, Bill?

17 MR. KNAUER: That would be fine.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. MENDENHALL: What number on
20 the agenda are you referring to?

21 MS. WILKINSON: 15, agency
22 reports, A, halibut jurisdiction.

23 MS. CROSS: So it's moved right
24 after 9.

25 MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chair?

MS. CROSS: Yes.

MR. MENDENHALL: I'd like to put
bear in there somewhere, I guess.

MS. CROSS: Put bear in there?

MR. MENDENHALL: I don't know if
it's in there or not. I think there's still
a problem.

MS. CROSS: Do you want to put
it -- maybe right after moose. Right after
11 -- put it as E, bear?

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah.
2 MS. CROSS: Did you want it after
3 9 instead?

3 MR. SEETOT: No, no.

4 MS. CROSS: Are there any other
5 changes for -- in our agenda?

6 MR. SEETOT: Madam Chair, I'd
7 like to have the caribou herd report.
Probably pretty much at the end of the wrap
of public meeting.

8 MS. CROSS: Okay.
9 So you want it right after agency
reports?

10 MR. SEETOT: Sure.

11 MR. BUCK: I move to adopt the
12 agenda as amended.

13 MS. DEGNAN: Second.

14 MS. CROSS: There's been a motion
15 to approve the agenda as amended by Peter
Buck, seconded by Frances Degnan.

16 MR. ENINGOWUK: Question.

17 MS. CROSS: Question has been
18 called. All those in favor, signify by
saying "aye."

19 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

20 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
21 same sign.
Motion carries.

22 We have adoption of minutes.
23 Frances?

24 MS. DEGNAN: I'll move to adopt
25 the minutes of March 29, 2001 as in the
packet.

MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.

MS. CROSS: There's been a motion

1 to approve the minutes of March 29th, 2001
as presented, and seconded.
2 Discussion?

3 MS. DEGNAN: Madam Chair, I think
the format was good. I like the minutes.
4 They're easy to read and acknowledges
everyone that participated.
5
6 MS. CROSS: They're very good.

7 MR. SEETOT: Madam Chair, page 4
under the top page, Brevig Mission: "The
Elders selected the hunters for the federal
8 muskoxen hunt in an effort to get the best
success rate." I think that was traditional
9 council at that time, not the Elders.

10 MS. DEGNAN: Traditional council.

11 MS. CROSS: Page 4, under Brevig
Mission, the very top paragraph.
12
13 MR. SEETOT: Not the Elders;
traditional council.

14 MS. CROSS: Traditional council
replacing Elders, right?
15 Any other corrections?
Are we happy with the -- with the
16 minutes?
17 MS. DEGNAN: Call for question.

18 MS. CROSS: Question has been
called. All those in favor of adopting the
minutes of March 29, 2001, with one
19 amendment, signify by saying "aye."

20 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

21 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
same sign.
22 Motion carries.
Council reports. We can begin
23 with Leonard.

24 MR. KOBUK: Me?

25 MS. CROSS: Yeah, you're in the
hot chair.

1
2 MR. KOBUK: We had a meeting a
3 few months ago, I guess, in St. Michael,
4 which was pretty good. I hope to have more
5 information about what's happening within
6 Federal subsistence management, and I'm sure
7 happy to see that the boundary issue has
8 been dealt with.

9 I'm pretty sure the waste of
10 caribou will be taken care of this winter,
11 because there's some guys at home that's
12 going to start checking for caribou permits
13 and also picture I.D.s, and they want us to
14 stop chasing long distance when it's cold
15 out, because the lungs tend to freeze -- get
16 stuck to the ribs. I guess that's the
17 worries of both villages, but the
18 personal -- there's a guy who owns his own
19 reindeer, wants to monitor the reindeer
20 because of poaching that happens every time
21 Yukon hunters come up to St. Michael. And I
22 guess they had their first -- because of
23 last winter, some guys from Yukon had
24 poached some reindeer and they had their
25 first -- what do you call it -- tribal
court? Haven't heard anything on that.

I guess Stebbins was going to try
to set -- make it so that the villages from
other regions will know that it's not going
to be tolerated anymore.

Our bird hunting is starting to
come. Berries were a little late this year.
First time I ever picked hard berries. We
couldn't wait because me and my wife every
summer we go down to Sheldon Point, which is
down in Nunam Iquaa to help her mom put fish
away or berry pick for her. It was a
weird -- weird summer. Pretty cold. Seemed
like our winter was warm and our summer was
cold from spring to summer. Now it's
supposed to be getting cold; seems to be
warmer than this summer.

So, that's about all I have. I
would like to welcome everyone. Good to see
everybody on the Board again.

24 MS. CROSS: Thank you.
25 Elmer?

1 MR. SEETOT: Not much to report
2 other than I attended a series of meetings
3 with Fish & Game for the caribou herd
4 planning committee and also for the work
5 group. No muskox has been taken or
6 harvested to date. One is that it has been
7 pretty much wet for the taking of muskox.
8 Activities were a little later than last
9 year, but for those that wanted certain
10 types of food, you know, they went out and
11 got them.

12 Caribou were around the
13 mountains, but the weather warmed up before
14 we could hunt. That was in May.

15 And it got cold at least for the
16 whole month of June, making our plants and
17 berries bloom later than usual this year.

18 Fish were plentiful around us.
19 The only factor that really played was the
20 wet weather, wet weather and constant winds
21 at Fort Brevig. And that's pretty much my
22 report.

23 MS. CROSS: Thank you.
24 Frances?

25 MS. DEGNAN: Fishing: We had a
26 lot of fish, a lot of humpies come, but the
27 weather was so wet. And the commercial
28 fisheries didn't buy the humpies. They
29 didn't have the market for them, so the
30 lucky few that were able to gauge the
31 weather right were able to put away their
32 traditional dried humpies; but for the rest
33 of them, they soured because the weather was
34 so wet and people watched the king salmon,
35 harvested what they could use, but not
36 anymore because of concern for recruitment.
37 And silvers were late, and it seemed to me
38 that they just went straight up from the
39 ocean, up to their spawning areas, so
40 they're being very evasive for being caught;
41 but if you followed them, you could get your
42 fish. We like the silvers when the skin
43 turns red and the meat is less fat. It
44 makes for a softer dried product because
45 it's cooler out, and it's our traditional
46 food.

47 There's a million bears,
48 because -- there seems to be a million

1 bears, and they're reported to have come
into our village last week, so they're --
2 and they're not afraid of the human being
anymore. They'll come right up to you. So,
3 you'll, like, shoot now and ask questions
later.

4 But they have been raiding the
fish racks. You have to live with your
5 fish. You have to be vigilant, so they've
eaten a lot of the dried product. So it's a
6 concern.

Another concern is we have a lot
7 of sport -- sport activity for fishing on
the river, and there's competition between
8 the commercial fishers, the sports and the
subsistence users and either -- I don't
9 think any of the groups are too happy with
the restrictions. Commercial fishers think
10 that the periods are not gauged to be
abundant to the fish quality. Sports,
11 they're really watched for what are
contained. Subsistence users are getting
12 limited as to when they can harvest the
product.

13 So, if we held back to how
traditionally we manage the resource, I
14 think the local tribal group would probably
be the best group to do the management
15 because they know what the weather is like.
They know what the thing is. I really
16 believe in the true definition of
subsistence -- from an indigenous viewpoint
17 is food on the table, and who knows best
what your resources are but from those who
18 are right on the scene?

So, we have the river with more
19 traffic coming through and that covers our
spawning area, so we would probably look at
20 what type of activity goes on on the rivers
in terms of recruitment of salmon. We have
21 the bears -- so many that they're hungry all
the time, so they're going to be going after
22 whatever is available to them, so the
easiest is going to be the spawning grounds
23 or to the subsistence fishers' drying rack
and to the landfill, which is not too far
24 from the village. There are more bears
there.

25 The landfill, the seagulls and
the ravens have been displaced; so they're

1 going elsewhere too, so they're going where
they can find the foods.

2 But with the weather being the
deciding factor, it's how the resource is
3 harvested, and a lot of us depend on the
food for subsistence. We take those into
4 consideration. But the toughest thing is to
have your subsistence fishing times managed.
5 There really shouldn't be any restriction on
when you can go fishing. That's the one
6 thing, because the weather is the one that
has the control, is a controlling factor.

7 So, we went through another
summer, and we went into winter, so people
8 will be looking for -- towards -- looking
for birds to go through and moose season is
9 closing. Moose was harvested, but there are
a lot of bears. That's what I see.

10

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Frances.
11 Johnson?

12 MR. ENINGOWUK: I think we had a
pretty good year. Our subsistence hunters
13 were a lot more less because of the previous
year. The spring hunt wasn't too good, but
14 it's been good this year. People have a lot
of food stored, a lot of fishing. I haven't
15 heard anyone get moose yet, but moose season
and muskox seasons are open.

16 Fish season is quite large. Half
the time I don't know what goes on, or what
17 people are doing anywhere in the village.

I think we were a little bit
18 thankful for the sports hunters this year.
They did come up and lessen our bear
19 population. I think I would recommend that,
and I think the village would welcome those
20 sports hunters to come back and lessen some
of those bears that are there.

21 I was down to our village over
the weekend. I did see a very large bear
22 down there, and I think there were sports
hunters that were there. It was right down
23 there.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. ENINGOWUK: The village is
not too much for eating brown bear, but I

1 think we could -- part-time come for one of
the resources for food for us, but we never
2 grew up on eating bear, so....

I think it's a hard time for us
3 to eat bear.

Our moose population is down.
4 We're back down to a shortened season. I
think the village has taken it well. They
5 know the moose population is a concern for
them, and I think with the shortened season
6 and the hunt, they can -- they can live with
it for a little while.

The caribou are always
7 ever-present. They're close to the village.
8 They're beyond their hunting boundaries. I
think it might be good for Wales to open the
9 caribou hunting range. I know they're
getting close that way. I think it's given
10 our reindeer herd a little pound, but I
think the village -- the villagers know what
11 our reindeer and caribou like. I think they
respect those reindeer herds.

I've heard they're real fat and
they're plentiful.

13 Muskox: I haven't heard anyone
get a muskox yet, but they're doing other
14 subsistence activities like berry picking
and a little bit of fishing.

15 Other than that, our year has
been good, and I think we're real close to
16 winter, and they're all looking forward to
winter.

17 Thank you for coming.

18 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Johnson.
Toby?

19 MR. ANUNGAZUK: On the muskox
20 part, the village had three State permits
and all the permits were filled. I'm not
21 aware of any Federal permits being filled.
The bear that Johnson mentioned, I think I
22 see the tracks.

Our village council was concerned
23 about the moose -- the moose in our area. I
don't think anyone has harvested so far. We
24 had seen some before the season opened.
There was a small salmon catch this summer,
25 and there was some people that talked to me
as well about caribou. They monitored, grew

1 up in Shishmaref, but I think they would
like it that their boundaries are moved
2 closer. We had a cold summer, and there's a
very small berry-picking and harvest is
3 slow.

We got a cultural permit from the
4 State last spring for moose harvest. One of
these guys sitting here was with us when we
5 harvested that moose. I don't have very
much to report.

6
MS. CROSS: Thank you, Toby.
7 Perry?

8 MR. MENDENHALL: I got my list
somewhere, but I'd like to mention that in
9 Nome we had a pretty successful moose hunt
around the Nome area, where it was a bull
10 that was in danger, so most bulls were shot
at, scared off from -- I think all the moose
11 were all down from the high country. They
were mostly still up high in the mountains
12 and not too close. They moved down near the
end of the 15th. It didn't give Nome a
13 chance to get a moose except for those that
really work at it with four-wheelers.

14 But I think the moose was up high
still because of the warm weather and
15 congregating to -- weren't congregating for
the cows yet. That made it extra hard to go
16 after the moose, both on State and Federal
land and other places where the road system
17 goes into.

Where we were, moose hunting up
18 in Kougarok, which took one day to go that
far, we found there were 30 caribou on the
19 wrong side of the bar. If they were on the
other side of the road, there would have
20 been five less caribou.

The caribou does not go on west
21 and east road. They're usually on the side
you can't shoot.

22
MS. DEGNAN: Smart.

23
MR. MENDENHALL: They'll probably
24 be moving over to the east side of Kougarok
road. As far as bear around Nome, they were
25 all plentiful. We encourage people to kill
bear because we feel they go after the moose

1 calves. They help deplete that, and they
also do mess up on the fish streams where
2 the salmon spawning grounds are.

So our Elders told us that and we
3 do have an Elders committee at Sitnasuak
Native Corporation. They tell us what's
4 wrong, where there's hardly any fish, why
there's hardly any moose.

5 So, the Elders tell us why things
happen the way they are.

6 So, bear and calving and fish,
they have a correlation to one another.

7 As far as muskox, I only
heard of one muskox being killed by Roy
8 Ashcroft. That's the only one I heard got a
muskox, sometime in August.

9 I don't know about others. As
far as the fishing around the Nome area and
10 the streams has forced many of the Nomeites
to go toward Teller, Koyuk Council fish
11 area, to go after fish.

Regardless of the changes they
12 made down to Area M. I mention Area M. We
did make some changes down there. They
13 suggested moving. In fact, the State fish
felt a big impact; and, therefore, they made
14 some changes down there on the regulations.

Regardless of those changes,
15 there was hardly any fish showing up to our
seven streams, and they had to close it
16 until late until they let their escapement
go. Even with Tier II, there were only 20
17 permits allowed with 50 fish permits. We
don't know what success rate that is unless
18 Fish & Game tells us.

If you did catch some chums
19 afterwards, it was in the bad time of the
season. Normally we catch and dry in June
20 when we are permitted to do some chums; it's
wet. A lot of the fish would spoil if they
21 did have some on the racks. I heard old
folks complaining about that.

22 There was a lower limit on the
chums and there was a lower limit on the
23 silvers. We had emergency orders for
closure and not to fish anymore. I heard it
24 on the radios. We do still have that fish
disaster term. We still need to resolve
25 that for our streams in the Nome area so we
wouldn't have to go too far to Koyuk fishery

1 and Teller.

2 We forced a lot of that -- forced
3 me to move my fish camp on the beach towards
4 Salmon River -- I mean Salmon Lake, so I can
5 try to fish out of Pilgrim. We weren't
6 allowed to fish out of Pilgrim, but I put a
7 camp there anyway just in case they opened
8 it later. That's a traditional way. We
9 didn't catch any fish on the ocean side. We
10 go to the Pilgrim area to catch fish. That
11 was always our secondary target for fish
12 when I was a small boy. I learned from my
13 Elders. I moved one camp up there in case.

14 I mentioned the Elders committee.
15 They're quite active and we depend on them.
16 We're doing publication of some of their
17 stories that they want corrected for
18 history. That will be information coming in
19 the future because I know my grandparents
20 have lived in the Deering area. I go once a
21 summer to my uncle's camp that he had up
22 there. I keep that alive. He was a gold
23 miner. I don't do gold mining. I go
24 hunting, berry picking from that camp. When
25 I was up there, we saw a small airplane
cruising, all white, avoided us. It seemed
like they were doing some illegal hunts over
there. They didn't want us to see the
airplane, stayed out of our way and
disappeared. I don't know why they're
coming on the State land up there. That's
where I'm located, where my ancestral
campgrounds are. That airplane, I think,
testifies to the fact that there is still
public illegal hunts in the places where we
can't -- where people are not around. I
think the fact that it's over State park way
over there near Deering. It's perverse to
do that. It's populated. That's in the
air.

21 As far as Sutnasuak sent me and
22 an Elder down to the State summit to view
23 that public process for trying to open up
24 subsistence in the State. It was a very hot
25 issue. The first day was given to values
for subsistence which is very top-notch and
I think it would be like a Blue book for our
values for subsistence, why Alaska needs
subsistence.

I think that was the first day.

1 The second day they had problems
2 with doing the actual plans for how to
3 implement subsistence. And I guess you
4 really -- read as well as I do in the
5 Anchorage Daily News that some of the urban
6 senators and representatives do not want a
7 constitutional amendment to allow rural
8 Alaskans to subsist. So, it would be right
9 for us in rural Alaska to write letters,
10 political opinion letters, to these senators
11 and representatives, even our own to ask for
12 a constitutional amendment so that we could
13 have subsistence priority among our -- on
14 our ancestral grounds.

15 And I even found that even some
16 Fish & Game people, both Federal and the
17 State may be conducive to not having
18 subsistence priority. There are some
19 undertones there that are pro. There are
20 some that are against it. So even among the
21 ranks of our staffers, I think both Federal
22 and State, there are some that are kind of
23 really fighting against it. And I think
24 that's a rift there and I think they also
25 support those representatives and state
 senators against subsistence. That's strong
 words.

1 I think rural Alaska is going to
2 have to come to grips with that, with taking
3 strong action against us. We've been
4 fighting over ten years, 1980s. That's 20
5 years for subsistence rights that we were
6 promised in statehood, so I think that State
7 Summit brought up a lot more -- opened up
8 more wounds than it probably healed both for
9 urban and rural.

10 I think we would -- I think as a
11 RAC, plus a subsistence committee, we need
12 to watch these legislators and do our action
13 as a people, as a village, and as a region.

14 That's all.

15 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Perry.
16 Peter?

17 MR. BUCK: The fishing for my
18 area was not very good and still if they did
19 catch fish the drying season was too wet to
20 put the fish away. So, like Perry said, we
21 had -- the fish were there, but we just

1 couldn't put them away, and we had -- our
2 moose season is now closed. We had a short
3 season this year, and there was a lot of
4 concern in the village that the season was
5 shortened at the wrong time, not when they
6 were -- when they could have -- when they
7 wanted to harvest them, when they wanted to
8 harvest them. There was a lot of concern of
9 that in the village. We still have a bear
10 problem in White Mountain. They wanted to
11 put a playground on it for the kids. They
12 did not want that playground when the
13 bears -- the bears come into the village --
14 there were a lot of concerns that they want
15 the playground where the bear didn't have
16 any access. They were centralized or
17 something like that. Bear problem is a
18 concern in White Mountain. They come right
19 up to the village, come right up to your
20 house.

21 And that's about all.
22 They hunted moose. We didn't get
23 any fish and no playground.

24 MR. MENDENHALL: And you had a
25 lot of visitors from Nome.

26 MR. KOBUK: Madam Chair?

27 MS. CROSS: Yes.

28 MR. KOBUK: There are a few
29 things I want to mention. One of them is
30 the bear problem that we have in both
31 villages. People that put away fish from
32 Stebbins or St. Michael, it's a problem.
33 There's too much bears. It's like Perry
34 said, they're killing all the young moose.
35 We have our -- moose population isn't very
36 good.

37 Also, too many beavers in the
38 rivers. I think they just need to open up
39 more beaver hunting, trapping, whatever,
40 because they're damming up the rivers and
41 causing problems for the fish, same with the
42 bears eating the fish. And also since they
43 closed our commercial fishing and limited
44 the subsistence fishing in the Yukon, it
45 seemed to affect us. We had the boats
46 coming in there. One of the reasons we

1 wanted to move the boundary was to protect
2 that area because that's where a lot of our
3 fish go to spawn.

4 What happened in the Yukon seems
5 to affect our region. We don't mind them
6 coming to hunt game, but it's the fish that
7 we are more worried about because that's --
8 both villages only do subsistence fishing.
9 We're not allowed to do any commercial
10 fishing, which I wish would happen to help
11 support our -- pay bills, and also at home.
12 At St. Michael they've caught quite a bit
13 of beluga. I think our village had hard --
14 enough that they're not going after them
15 anymore. I heard some people at Stebbins
16 say that they need to catch some. So we've
17 been lucky in belugas this summer, which was
18 pretty good. I had to turn down some beluga
19 because I already had what I need from a
20 friend of mine, so....

21 That's all I have to say.

22 MS. CROSS: Thanks.

23 MR. KOBUK: That's why I didn't
24 want to go first, I know somebody would give
25 me....

26 MS. CROSS: Thank you very much
27 somebody. I heard a number of concerns.

28 One of them I heard was wanton waste of
29 caribou, poaching, naturally overwhelming
30 bear population concerns this Council very
31 much. I had a bear experience this summer
32 for the first time since we moved here in
33 1982. This was the very first year we had
34 to kill a bear just to protect ourselves.
35 We killed it eight feet from a camp as it
36 was charging my husband, and this happened
37 just not long ago. So, bear population,
38 overabundance of it is a very big concern in
39 our region.

40 I also heard -- I'm not sure if
41 there are conflicts, but sports hunting
42 activity in the Unalakleet River, and some
43 problems with the permits of fishing, in
44 particular with subsistence users. I also
45 heard -- our big concern -- a concern that
46 seems to be from all parts of 22 is moose
47 population being down. The season's being

1 shortened and being shortened. They moved
 2 it to the wrong part of the year almost to
 3 the point where people are not getting their
 4 moose. And Johnson expressed that the
 5 caribou hunting area should be moved closer
 6 to Wales because of our moose population
 7 being bound. I agree with him. It's
 8 something that ought to be looked at.

9 Perry's concern was that moose
 10 hunters in Nome were not given much of a
 11 chance to get moose. It was extra hard to
 12 get moose because the moose population in
 13 both State and Federal lands because the
 14 moose population is still up high, and that
 15 it was hard for people to get any.

16 And then, of course, the road
 17 system, even though some of the moose
 18 country had seen caribou, it was on the
 19 wrong side of the road, so maybe that's
 20 something to look at again in the future.

21 And his concern is also about his place as a
 22 fisherman. This Council has been expressing
 23 that for a number of years, what impact the
 24 fishermen are going to have in other areas
 25 of the state where fish population is still
 healthy, and he is right. We're still in
 the fish disaster, and it kind of looked
 like our fish disaster is spreading into
 other parts of our subsistence use, like the
 moose population, because of the population
 of the bear.

And if I miss anything, I'm sure
 Ann will write down our concerns very well.
 But this is what I kind of summarized from
 everybody.

And did you want to -- on that
 805 letter and the annual letter, I forgot
 to mention that earlier, should we just go
 ahead and --

MS. WILKINSON: Go ahead.

MS. CROSS: Any other comments
 from the Council?

Thank you very much for your
 reports, and I'm sure Ann will write down
 what our concerns are.

We have many concerns this year.

Okay. Now, for the Chair's
 report. I went to the Federal Subsistence

1 Board meeting. During our Chairs' meetings,
 2 we basically talked about the same problems
 3 that we have in the past. One of them being
 4 travel problems, which seemed to have
 5 increased since Omega took over. And
 6 essentially just about every part of the
 7 state had similar problems as we did here in
 8 the last meeting. Fortunately, this meeting
 9 we didn't have any problems.

10 Part of the thing was that the
 11 Omega would issue electronic tickets to hub
 12 cities and people would end up stuck in the
 13 villages; they can't go to Alaska Airlines
 14 to pick up the tickets. That happened for
 15 Elmer. Elmer is in Brevig. His ticket was
 16 in Nome because it was issued
 17 electronically. That was last year. It
 18 happened to a number of our RAC members. It
 19 looks like this year it's been resolved, but
 20 that was one issue that was brought up
 21 because some people just couldn't go to
 22 meetings because of the ticket problems.

23 Of course, compensation of the
 24 RAC members was another issue that we
 25 brought back up again. There's so many
 people that take time away from their
 subsistence activities, from their jobs to
 attend the RAC meetings, and the
 compensation is really -- you end up being
 at a loss.

And there was discussion, the
 customary and trade committee, we wanted to
 make sure that the RAC members continue to
 be part of this process and to make sure
 that the input comes from rural parts of
 Alaska.

That was basically -- oh, a lack
 of fish was another issue that -- it's a
 statewide issue all the RACs are concerned
 about because we are not the only area
 that's affected. Other parts of Alaska are
 experiencing the same problems that we are
 having.

Those are the issues that we
 brought to the Federal Subsistence Board,
 and at the Federal Subsistence Board
 meeting, our proposal on the muskox for --
 as mentioned in the Mitch Demientieff letter
 that was passed. The other letters that
 affected us were proposals one and two; as I

1 remember, both of them were passed.

2 I want to add a Chair's report
3 for what's been going on in our region. We
4 have been extremely busy. The RAC has been
5 extremely busy due to a number of reasons.
6 One is lack of fish and moose, overabundance
7 of bear and muskox. There were several
8 meetings held at the village level and
9 teleconference throughout this year. There
10 was a meeting in Shishmaref organized by
11 Kate Persons with Alaska Department of Fish
12 & Game addressing muskoxen. There were
13 representatives from Wales present at that
14 meeting; and Ken Adkisson will probably
15 expound on what happened at that meeting
16 when he does that report tomorrow. The
17 meeting was well attended and participation
18 from the community was tremendous. I don't
19 know what the number was. I want to thank
20 the members of both Wales and Shishmaref for
21 putting input into the matters that were
22 discussed. I thank Johnson, Daniel, and
23 Toby for their participation.

24 Kate Persons also held a meeting
25 later in the Villages of Shishmaref and
Wales. This was regarding moose, and we'll
be hearing from Kate on what the two
communities were able to come up with that
Johnson discussed earlier. I didn't attend
the meetings. However, I believe Johnson
was there. Daniel and -- Toby, you were
there too at that moose meeting?

17 MR. ANUNGAZUK: No.

18 MS. CROSS: And so they were able
19 to help address the moose issue.

20 We also had a meeting that
21 Leonard mentioned in Stebbins/St. Michael
22 regarding the fish boundary issue, and we
23 also -- and a proposal was made over there
24 with the help of the Federal staff there,
25 Ann Wilkinson, Richard Uberuaga, Charlie
Lean. They went to the meeting. I went
with them, and they helped the community
draft the proposal that we will be
addressing.

This meeting too was packed.
They even had a representative from the
Village of Unalakleet during that meeting.

1 I do thank those villages,
2 including the participant from Unalakleet
3 for participating and providing input for
4 their -- for Federal Subsistence Management.
5 And Leonard put so much work into the
6 meeting, and conducted that excellent
7 meeting. He actually ran the meeting. And
8 I thank Ann, Richard, and Charlie for the
9 information you provided to the meeting and
10 for assisting in making the proposal.

11 The Unit 22D moose population was
12 done by a lot of people. Elmer Seetot
13 worked on obtaining information from Mission
14 Brevig. Ike, Ken, Ann, and Charlie worked
15 with Teller. Just last week Ken and Fred
16 arranged a teleconference with Teller IRA
17 Council to get their input. Charlie, Kate,
18 and I attended that teleconference. Teller
19 elected to send two representatives to
20 address their moose issue here, and Elmer
21 will be a voice for Brevig Mission.

22 In 22B, Austin Ahmasuk of Kawerak
23 worked very hard with the Villages of White
24 Mountain and Golovin and got information for
25 us. Peter Buck worked with the citizens of
26 White Mountain and participated in a meeting
27 that Kate Persons had at White Mountain.
28 Charlie Lean has been contacting individuals
29 from Golovin, and I'm sure that you will
30 hear from each of the persons I named as we
31 address the moose problem from that game
32 unit.

33 I thank everyone who helped and I
34 thank the citizens of White Mountain,
35 Golovin for providing information.

36 ADF&G held a town meeting in Nome
37 that Perry mentioned -- they had a town
38 meeting in Nome to address 22C, and
39 different parts of the rural area. It was
40 at that time that emergency orders had came
41 out in the state where some of the dates
42 were decided at that time, and Perry
43 attended all of those meetings pretty much
44 on his own time. He attended the advisory
45 council meeting that was held in Nome, and
46 provided much input. I thank Perry for his
47 work.

48 And throughout the year I've
49 called Frances and Preston. They seem to
50 have a little less problems with moose, so

1 we didn't quite address those, but they gave
valuable advice to me each time.

2 Thank you very much. And that's
my report.

3 Any questions from anybody?
Ann?

4
MR. ENINGOWUK: Madam Chair, can
5 we take a break?

6 MS. CROSS: Sure.
Can we take a ten-minute break at
7 this time?

(Break.)

8
MS. CROSS: I'm going to call the
9 meeting back to order. It's now 9:50.
805 letter.
10 Ann?

11 MS. WILKINSON: Madam Chairman,
Council, if you look under Tab C you'll find
12 the 805 letter from the last board meeting,
and I would just summarize that to say that
13 they -- review of proposals one and two, the
Board adopted that proposal at the
14 recommendation of the Western Interior,
Eastern Interior, Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta,
15 Southeast, Kodiak-Aleutians, Bristol Bay,
Seward Peninsula, Northwest Arctic, and
16 North Slope Regional Advisory Councils.
And proposal 35, which was the
17 muskoxen proposal that Seward Peninsula
Cooperative Muskoxen Management Working
18 Group put together. The Board adopted that
proposal as recommended by the Council, the
19 Northwest Arctic Regional Council, the
Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and the
20 Interagency Staff Committee.

Those are the only proposals that
21 the Council reviewed at the last meeting.

22 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Ann.

23 MR. MENDENHALL: We should send a
letter of thank you for their acceptance of
24 those proposals and action that they've
taken.

25
MS. CROSS: We should send a

1 letter to thank them, Ann.

2 MR. MENDENHALL: That way to keep
communication open. Ann can sign it on
3 behalf of the RAC.

4 Could you do that, Ann?

5 MS. WILKINSON: Okay.

6 MS. CROSS: We could include that
in our next letter, Ann.

7 MR. ENINGOWUK: Madam Chair, I
think I would like -- whoever started the
8 cooperative muskox group, I think they did a
good job. It raised awareness for a process
9 for muskox in our region to the people. I
think it's a good group, and I think it
10 enhances the population of the -- enhances
the population of muskox for our villages.

11 MS. CROSS: I agree with you. It
12 is a good working group. They do work
really hard to address our issues regarding
13 muskoxen.

14 Ann, Federal report and the
Federal Subsistence Board response.

15 MS. WILKINSON: Under Tab D is a
copy of the council's annual report. I
16 drafted it, sent it out to all the council
members, incorporated your comments, sent it
17 to Grace, and then she signed it.

18 So, this is the compilation of
everyone's work.

19 I don't think I need to read it
into the record.

20 Then the Board's response is
following that letter. And, as you can see,
they broke it down by issue. There were six
21 issues that the Council brought forward.
And Issue No. 1 regarding Norton Sound
22 fisheries, they encourage the council to
bring more -- excuse me -- they encouraged
23 the council to continue to work closely with
the Office of Subsistence Management and the
24 Board on these fisheries. And they said
that the council can submit more proposals
25 for them to consider, especially about the
Unalakleet River issue.

1 Issue 2: Information about the
 2 boundary change with Wales, the Board
 3 appreciated the information regarding
 4 boundary issues in the Seward Peninsula
 5 region and regarding the Wales boundary
 6 issue. They determined there are no Federal
 7 waters in the area, in the Norton Sound
 8 area, used by the Wales residents.
 9 Therefore, the Board cannot provide positive
 10 Federal customary and traditional use
 11 determinations for that area. The residents
 12 of Wales may still fish in the Norton
 13 Sound-Port Clarence area appropriate under
 14 the State regulations.

15 Issue No. 3: Impacts about the
 16 caribou herd on the Seward Peninsula
 17 reindeer. The Federal Subsistence Board
 18 supports the appointment of Elmer Seetot to
 19 the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working
 20 Group. The Board also notes the Council's
 21 concerns about the effects of caribou, the
 22 influx of caribou into that area and these
 23 concerns are being addressed by local
 24 agencies.

25 Regarding muskoxen, they
 26 appreciated the update of information and
 27 acknowledge and support the work of the
 28 Muskox Cooperative Group and they're very
 29 pleased that members of the council are a
 30 part of the cooperative group.

31 Issue No. 5: The Council
 32 requested that the Board consider future
 33 need to exert extraterritorial jurisdiction
 34 for fisheries management.

35 The secretaries of the Department
 36 and -- excuse me, Department of the Interior
 37 and the Department of Agriculture have that
 38 authority. The Board does not. And they
 39 may petition the secretaries for their
 40 recommendation, in this area, they may be
 41 aware that this may be held to a high
 42 standard of examination and a favorable
 43 decision may take years to implement due to
 44 court appeals. They encourage people to
 45 work as much as possible with the managing
 46 agencies to provide for subsistence needs.

47 MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chair?

48 MS. CROSS: Yes, Perry.

1

MR. MENDENHALL: In regards to Norton Sound fisheries, even though they say that they have a meeting on 2003-04 -- every year in October they have a work session to deal with -- the topic that they discuss is fish stocks -- concerns which covers a broad range like maybe -- and even in the work session, they discuss that; but, we, as observers cannot participate. We are able to talk to them during their breaks about it. So this October, I would encourage Western Alaska villages to perhaps attend their work session in October and there will probably be another one in February. The way you would find out their agendas is to go to their Web site, WWW Fish & Game Board -- I forgot what the Web site call is for that. But it would address that. They have an agenda, because any discussions or work session that they do, they usually have in October; and they usually have a follow-up one in November, and they discuss a lot of things.

There's some influence that can be done, like on the crab by-catch for our area. We were able to deal with that with the Aleuts. The Aleuts were always there. Same with Bristol Bay. Even though there's no action taken, I would encourage maybe Wales residents and staff to go to that and just be there.

17

MS. DEGNAN: Is that the State Board?

18

MR. MENDENHALL: And be aware of what business that they are conducting.

20

MS. DEGNAN: Madam Chair?

On the issue No. 1, I would request that we work with the group down in Unalakleet, between the Unalakleet River, the same way -- it's a site-specific concern, so I think we really should go to the local group to address what the management issues are to get it from the local level, and that should apply to any type of issue when it comes to management and enforcement of regulations at the --

25

1 that the local groups need to be part of the
2 mix in making a decision on what they're
going to have to live by.

3 MS. CROSS: Last year I tried to
4 really encourage doing that and was able to
have some of the park service staff in --
5 St. Michael staff, and of course, Kate
Persons with ADF&G, in the villages to bring
6 the local villages and were able to come up
with pretty good input. So, I've been
7 trying to encourage that.

8 MS. DEGNAN: I would request a
9 meeting like that to keep up with river
issues.

10 MS. CROSS: That's something to
look for in the future.

11 MS. WILKINSON: I'm sorry, I
12 missed the last part of what she said.

13 MS. DEGNAN: To have a meeting
14 with the local community pertaining to the
river issues.

15 MS. WILKINSON: Okay.

16 MS. DEGNAN: Pertaining to
fisheries.

17 MS. CROSS: She was specific to
18 the Unalakleet River.

19 MR. MENDENHALL: We can't really
20 hear you. We're trying to hear what you're
saying.

21 MS. DEGNAN: What I'm requesting
is that this council make sure that the
22 Unalakleet River, the meetings be held in
Unalakleet specific to the river issues
23 pertaining to fish stocks because we have
the subsistence use and we have the
24 commercial fisheries use and the sports --
we have a lot of sports going on in the
25 river. It is a scenic river, so there are a
lot of local concerns, so I would rather
have it come from the community as to how we

1 need to approach these issues and how do we
 2 make sure that the stock keeps returning.
 3 And your best shot is to do it locally,
 4 involve the local people. And that would
 5 apply to any -- any species, anywhere
 6 there's concern.

7 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Frances.
 8 Issue 6, I think.

9 MS. WILKINSON: Issue 6 is
 10 regarding the stipend for council members.
 11 Carl Jack, in our office, is following up on
 12 that. We'll be discussing that with the
 13 council later in the meeting. But the Board
 14 did respond in that they are sympathetic and
 15 they are working with Mr. Jack -- excuse me,
 16 that he's drafted the letter to the
 17 secretary of the Department of the Interior
 18 and the Department of Agriculture on the
 19 Board's behalf, and then once that letter
 20 goes out -- I'm sorry, I don't know whether
 21 it has been mailed out yet -- it will just
 22 depend on the secretary's response.

23 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Ann.
 24 Anymore comments from the council
 25 regarding our past issues which are still
 26 our issues?

27 Hearing none.
 28 I forgot to announce that public
 29 testimony is ongoing throughout our meeting.
 30 People that need to talk to us need to
 31 complete a card and give it to Ann and we'll
 32 give -- if anybody wants to say something to
 33 the council, please just let me know.

34 Okay.
 35 Fisheries proposal for Council
 36 review and recommendation to Federal
 37 Subsistence Board, Tab E.
 38 Ann?

39 MS. WILKINSON: Proposal No. 44:
 40 That would be Pat McClenahan.

41 MS. CROSS: Pat, sorry Pat.

42 MS. McCLENAHAN: Madam Chair, I'm
 43 Pat McClenahan, regional anthropologist; and
 44 I'm going to present the draft staff

1 analysis to you for proposal FP02-044 that's
2 at Tab E.

3 Proposal FP02-044 was submitted
4 by Leonard Kobuk on behalf of the
5 communities of St. Michael and Stebbins. It
6 requests an exclusive positive customary and
7 traditional use determination for the
8 communities of St. Michael and Stebbins for
9 salmon and for all freshwater fish species
10 in the drainages and water bodies northwest
11 of the Andreafsky River drainage, between
12 Canal Point and Point Romanof. These
13 drainages are known as the Pikmiktalik
14 River. I referred you to map 1 on page 4 of
15 the analysis in your book.

16 On pages 3 and 4 of the analysis,
17 you can review the present customary and
18 traditional use determination for this area
19 for the subsistence taking of salmon and
20 freshwater fish. Presently, the residents
21 of Norton Sound, Port Clarence area, and
22 residents of the Yukon River drainage all
23 have a positive customary and traditional
24 use finding for all fish species for the
25 Pikmiktalik River group area.

26 The proposed regulation is Norton
27 Sound-Port Clarence Area, excluding waters
28 draining into Norton Sound between Point
29 Romanof and Canal Point, all fish, residents
30 of the Norton Sound-Port Clarence Area.

31 Waters draining into Norton Sound
32 between Canal Point, all fish, residents of
33 Stebbins and St. Michael only.

34 The current Wales residents'
35 customary and traditional use was adopted
36 unmodified by the Federal Subsistence
37 Board -- I'm sorry, the Wales Residents'
38 Subsistence Program, our program, from the
39 existing State findings without review at
40 the time the Wales residents' program began.

41 94 communities in the combined
42 Norton Sound-Port Clarence and Yukon River
43 use area presently have a positive customary
44 use finding for salmon for this Pikmiktalik
45 River Group area; aligning the Wales
46 residents' and State fisheries boundaries
47 did not automatically exclude subsistence
48 users in the Yukon River area.

49 This analysis reviews published
50 subsistence use information for 24

1 communities within approximately a 150-mile
2 radius of the Pikmiktalik River group area,
3 taking into consideration that the timing
4 and location of the seasonal round of
5 subsistence activities may change or may
6 have changed through time as climates and
7 environments change and availability and
8 timing of subsistence use has changed.

9 And with regard to the eight
10 factors for determining customary and
11 traditional uses, I'll concentrate on
12 factors one and four.

13 Initial analysis shows that while
14 all of the communities listed on page 6 of
15 the analysis have a long-term consistent
16 reliance to a greater or lesser degree on
17 salmon and on other freshwater fish, three
18 communities, St. Michael, Stebbins, and
19 Kotlik are documented as consistently using
20 the salmon and nonsalmon fish species at the
21 Pikmiktalik group. They have used the
22 Pikmiktalik River group for fishing
23 historically and during modern times.

24 Residents of St. Michael and Stebbins have
25 fish camps that are established and
permanent in the Pikmiktalik River area.

There, they take the dry salmon -- take and
dry salmon and other fish for storage and
residents of St. Michael, Stebbins, and
Kotlik also fish to meet their immediate
needs while they're in the area berry
picking, hunting, and carrying out other
subsistence activities. Published sources
have no information about use of the
Pikmiktalik River group area by listing of
other communities listed on page 6. Our
preliminary conclusion, therefore, is to
support the proposal with modification.

We recommend adding the community
of Kotlik, provide a positive customary and
traditional use finding exclusive to
St. Michael, Stebbins, and Kotlik for the
federally administered waters draining into
Norton Sound between Point Romanof and Canal
Point. Justification for this conclusion is
that Stebbins, St. Michael, and Kotlik are
heavily reliant upon subsistence resources
for their livelihoods. All three villages
are situated immediately next to the
Pikmiktalik River group and share many of

1 the same salmon and freshwater fishing
2 areas. They are also part of the same
3 sharing and communications network.
4 Residents of St. Michael provided
5 information that they used the Pikmiktalik
6 River group for subsistence fishing and that
7 their parents and grandparents did as well.
8 For the other communities listed on page 6,
9 currently there is insufficient information
10 to determine if they use the Pikmiktalik
11 River Group to take subsistence salmon
12 and/or nonsalmon fish.

13 This is a preliminary conclusion
14 and we seek additional information through
15 the Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
16 and through the affected villages.

17 Madam Chair, this concludes
18 presentation of the draft staff analysis.

19 Please give us your recommendation and tell
20 us why you're making that recommendation.

21 Thank you, Madam Chair.

22 MS. CROSS: Thank you. Any
23 questions for Pat?

24 MS. DEGNAN: I just have a
25 comment to make --

MR. MENDENHALL: Madam chair --

MS. CROSS: Just a minute,
Frances --

MS. DEGNAN: I just have a
comment to make pertaining to Unalakleet and
you have it there in your work here that
were Inupiat Borough. Unalakleet is the
Nakwalek community. It's the division
between the Inupiat and the Yup'ik. I make
that correction. And I also spoke with
Dorothy Jean Ray. I just spoke with her a
couple days ago, so she sent me some of her
reports of her -- reprints of her papers
that she wrote, so I'm in constant
communication with her, and she said she'll
be happy to send more information to me.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Excellent. If
there's anything at all you'd like to
provide me, please feel free. I can give

1 you my card.

2 MS. DEGNAN: Thanks.

3 MS. CROSS: Perry?

4 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, on page
17, you have the spelling there regarding
5 Golovin Bay and Golovin Lagoon, the bottom
of there is inconsistent with reference to
6 Golovin. I think it was just a typo, maybe.

7 MS. McCLENAHAN: Okay. I'll
check it.

8 MR. MENDENHALL: It should be
9 consistent as we're referring to Golovin.

10 MS. McCLENAHAN: Thank you.

11 MR. KOBUK: Madam Chair?

12 MS. CROSS: Yes.

13 MR. KOBUK: The IRA council, when
I received this booklet, I had showed what
14 was listed for St. Michael saying that they
have no knowledge that the people of
15 St. Michael, the Natives fished and hunted.
From what I heard from my own Dad is that
16 St. Michael used to be a Russian Port and
then it was an Army port also after the
17 Russians left. From the experience that
they had with these people, they found out
18 there at St. Michael, the Natives did, that
they would not let anybody -- any outsiders
19 know what they were doing because when they
went out to hunt or fish, usually they'd end
20 up getting -- landing in jail at the time it
used to be U.S. Marshal. The reason you
21 have no document on this is that during the
gold rush that St. Michael had to deal with
22 the Natives, they just said that they
weren't going to let no outsiders know
23 what -- where they hunt, where they fish.
But me, for myself, I know that -- about
24 what my Dad tells me, that we've always
hunted and fished just about all over
25 because most of the hunting and fishing was
done by walking and to -- to include Kotlik

1 with St. Michael and Stebbins, and the miles
here, every year, winter and summer. I
2 travel by boat in summer to the Yukon and I
travel by snow machine. Kotlik isn't 50
3 miles from where the Pikmiktalik is. If you
go in a straight line, it may be, but you
4 can never always go in a straight line. And
we want to just make Pikmiktalik and
5 Nunakogok just exclusive of the residents of
St. Michael and Stebbins to protect the
6 fish. We're not only thinking about our
generation, we're thinking about the next
7 generation that's coming up.

The information that was taken
8 from the people here, we find that it --
they met the IRA Council; they were mad.
9 And I'm still mad about it. But we just
told ourself, "Well, if we can't depend on
10 the Federal government or the State
government, then we'll just manage our own
11 Fish & Game in our areas because that's the
only way we see of protecting our right to
12 hunt and to fish where our fathers and
grandfathers have hunted and fished."

13 So, I don't go along with the
findings in this packet here and neither do
14 the people of St. Michael. And that's all I
have to say about that.

15
MS. CROSS: Thank you, Leonard.
16 Perry?

17 MR. MENDENHALL: It's a starting
point. I think if you can accept this, we
18 could build on it later. I think that would
be the plus side. That's the way I look at
19 it. You have another region involved, plus
you got other villages involved.

20
MR. KOBUK: Yes. We're most
21 concerned in the two villages because we're
connected. We're on the same island. We're
22 connected by a road, dirt road system. We
want to protect those little rivers that we
23 have. They're not very big. When the tide
goes down, our mouth is just about as big as
24 this room.

25 MR. MENDENHALL: But the general
description, just clarifying the case of

1 customary and traditional use, that's a step
2 forward and not having it at all. You can
3 build it, your people in your younger
4 generation can build on it strongly and put
5 that Russian history in there too. I think
6 that would be a useful --

7 MR. KOBUK: The Russian history
8 and the Army history we don't like to talk
9 about because many of the things that the
10 Russians did to the Natives -- did there to
11 the Natives in the village and the Army that
12 were stationed there really because --
13 actually, I'm part Russian through my Mom's
14 side, but I don't like to be included in
15 that area because of what they did to the
16 Natives.

17 MR. MENDENHALL: It's tradition.

18 MR. KOBUK: I'd just rather to
19 stay on the side -- my dad's dad was Kobuk.
20 There's not only there Inupiat. It's
21 Inupiat and Yup'ik mixed.

22 MR. MENDENHALL: It's better to
23 put the statement of customary and
24 traditional use determination on the books
25 and recognize it and then build on it later
to make it stronger. Right now --

MR. KOBUK: I would agree with
that part.

MR. MENDENHALL: No, now you
don't have it. That's all I'm shooting for.
You can go back and amend the supporting
documents. They have all the documents they
have in there.

MR. KOBUK: The documents we see
in there, we don't agree with it.

MR. MENDENHALL: I realize that.
Nome, everybody realizes, we got a lot of
villages from King Island, Golovin here in
Nome. We have to accept that what took
place has changed. I think we recognize --
the point is, add it to the books as
Stebbins and St. Michaels as a plus. That's

1 all I'm saying. I would rather see you
folks get that than say you don't want it.
2 Then it gets put aside again. Probably
going to be harder to put it before us right
3 now the way it is. And I think it's a
positive move. Later on, you can build on
4 it, make it stronger, like Nome is doing
with this -- stating we used to trade the
5 Shishmaref, Deering, we had a road to
Deering in the territorial days. Nobody in
6 the state doesn't want to recognize that.
So I think it's a plus if you support this
7 proposal for clarification and make it
stronger down the road.

8 It would help your people and
your case to put it on the books now and I
9 think that's a plus. I would vote for this
proposal because you said you didn't have
10 any on the books.

Now, this is putting it on the
11 books, on the Federal level. It's higher
than the State. So -- and then the State
12 would have to recognize it too, as the State
documents. Federal and State documents
13 going with your IRA is a step. And I would
encourage Stebbins and St. Michael to do
14 this from a Nome point of view. Because
Nome has had a lot of hurdles we had to go
15 through, like we have to accept people from
outside our region to participate in Nome
16 Native politics.

So, I think that you are remiss
17 if you go on and don't support this
proposal. I would encourage support for
18 this proposal as a start.

19 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Perry.
Any more questions for -- or
20 comments to Pat?

21 MS. DEGNAN: I would just like to
state for the record that back in the early
22 '50s the tribes of the five villages along
Norton Sound filed a traditional boundary
23 area, and that went from Koyuk through down
to the Pastolik and that was their use in
24 this -- for their survival, five villages;
and their range at least was 9 million acres
25 of land, sea, and air, in order to survive.
So that's a Federal document that was -- I

1 mean, a document by local tribes responding
2 to Federal policy saying, "Claim your lands
3 now or forever after shut up." So, the
4 local tribes have always asserted their use
5 of the area, and it's always been
6 site-specific because they knew where they
7 ranged. So, that would follow along the
8 St. Michael and Stebbins use all the way
9 down to Pastolik as their range. That
10 included the communities of St. Michaels,
11 Stebbins, Ungalik, and Koyuk, those five
12 villages.

13 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Frances.
14 Thank you, Pat.
15 Alaska Department of Fish & Game.
16 ADF&G.

17 MR. MENDENHALL: Do we need a
18 formal motion on this -- do we need to make
19 a motion and discussion -- and second and
20 discussion what they're doing for the
21 proposal? These are action items.

22 MS. CROSS: These are for the
23 positions of the different agencies right
24 now.

25 I thought that the motions are
normally done when it's time for
deliberation.

MR. MENDENHALL: I think the
motion is in order before discussion or
argument.

MS. CROSS: They're giving us
information right now.

MR. MENDENHALL: I know, but in
order for the information to be digested, we
need a motion on the proposal before
discussion or actions can be taken. I think
we're doing discussion and information on
the proposal. That is action. I think -- I
would make a motion to -- for approval of
FP02-44, accept a summary on it because it's
for us to determine because we gave the
action for them to write it up.

MS. CROSS: Normally, what we've

1 done in the past is we've listened to
2 everybody, when it's time for regional
3 council, recommendation, justification,
4 that's when a motion comes in.

5 MR. MENDENHALL: Is there a
6 motion now on this?
7 I so move.

8 MS. DEGNAN: He asked if there
9 was a motion. I said, no.

10 MS. CROSS: No, there's no
11 motion. In the past we've done it for Step
12 G.

13 MR. MENDENHALL: I did make a
14 motion. I make a motion if it dies, we
15 taken action on it. Proposal for it.

16 MS. CROSS: There's a proposal
17 for it.
18 Is there a second?

19 MR. SEETOT: I second the motion.

20 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay.

21 MS. CROSS: Move to discussion?
22 Go ahead.

23 MR. MAGDANZ: My name is Jim
24 Magdanz. I'm with the Alaska Department of
25 Fish & Game Subsistence. Briefly, the
26 State's position on this proposal is to
27 support it and to make the comment that the
28 determination currently in regulation
29 includes a large number of communities, and
30 this would represent a significant
31 restriction in the number of communities who
32 are eligible for C and T use of fish in this
33 area. We would also comment that the
34 Board -- that the Council should consider
35 testimony from residents of other
36 communities in the region who may have
37 customary and traditional use of this area,
38 and should that evidence come before the
39 Council, those should be included in the
40 C and T findings.

1 MS. CROSS: Questions or
comments?

2 MR. MENDENHALL: I support his
3 proposal for State support.

4 MS. CROSS: Thank you very much.
Other agency comments?
5 Fish & Game advisory committee
comments?
6 Summary of written permit
comments?

7 MS. WILKINSON: I'll come up here
8 because we had quite a few.

I'll just write summaries, but I
9 have the full comments with me if anyone
wants to see them. Native Village of
10 St. Michael wrote to support the proposal.
The people of St. Michael do use the rivers
11 listed in proposal 44 for subsistence and
have done so from time immemorial. Their
12 concern is to protect these rivers from
overharvest. That was signed by Pius
13 Washington, president.

The St. Michael Native
14 Corporation supports this proposal -- they
said they support all the proposals written
15 by Leonard Kobuk, signed by Bernadette Joe,
president and all the officers of the
16 corporation.

The Elders of St. Michael said
17 that they have always fished at Pikmiktalik
and rivers in that area for salmon and
18 herring in summer and in winter months.
They stated, quote, "Our traditions are
19 taught to us, handed down one generation to
the next. Everything we know, we've
20 respectfully learned from our parents and
grandparents. We would like to see the
21 continuation of use of our traditional
hunting and fishing grounds by our families
22 of this generation and those that will come.
We realize the importance of subsistence and
23 protection and proper management of these
resources. Therefore, our support and
24 obligation to take part in this important
topic," end quote. And that was signed by
25 Andrew Otten, Chairman and Clifford Tom,
Vice-chairman.

1 Stebbins Native Corporation wrote
2 in support, local residents are concerned
3 that the subsistence resources within their
4 local rivers that are now available to both
5 villages cannot support other users from
6 other villages and sport fishing. Past
7 studies in -- fish resources in local rivers
8 indicate the size of the returns are --
9 excuse me, are sufficient to support
10 subsistence needs of the two communities.

11 That's signed by Morris Coffey,
12 CEO of Stebbins Native Corporation.

13 The Stebbins Community
14 Association, IRA council sends a letter that
15 stated their support for the proposal
16 unanimously.

17 Harry Wild of Kotlik writing as
18 an individual and not in an official
19 capacity, wrote in support of this proposal
20 and said -- well, I'm sorry -- he didn't see
21 the analysis when he wrote this comment,
22 just the proposal. When he was 12 years
23 old, he moved to St. Michael with his sister
24 and brother and lived for six years with his
25 grandma and grandpa. They lived at winter
 camp at Little Canal River area. It's
 traditionally a subsistence fishing and
 hunting area used by the residents of
 Stebbins and St. Michael. He supports an
 exclusive customary and traditional use
 proposal as set out in Proposal 44.

 And then Kotlik -- excuse me,
Kotlik Yup'ik Corporation wrote in
opposition to the proposal. They said that
Pikmiktalik River group has been a harvest
river area for Fish & Game for time
immemorial for people residing in the
Yukon/Norton Sound area. Many of us that
live along the Yukon have relatives or are
descendants of other groups up and down the
river. With consistent south winds many
Yukon salmon would go to Norton Sound and
follow the coastline back to the Yukon.
They may enter our rivers as they continue
to feed. Fish are not constrained by
country. To limit the harvest to only two
communities will indeed provide a ration,
and regulatory crackdown will make criminals
of U.S. river system. And that is signed by
the fisheries coordinator.

1 That is all the comments.

2 MS. CROSS: Any comments or
questions for Ann?

3 Thank you, Ann.

4 Public testimony?

5 Anybody waving their arm?

6 No?

7 Regional Council deliberation,
recommendation, and justification.

8 I think we've been discussing
this for quite a number of years, and it's
finally come down to where we have an
analysis.

9 MS. DEGNAN: Madam Chair, I would
be in favor of the proposal because it's
adjacent to the two communities that use
these rivers year-around.

10 MS. CROSS: You're talking about
the proposal as submitted by --

11 MS. DEGNAN: By Leonard. And I
want to ask Leonard a question: Do people
from Kotlik use that area?

12 MR. KOBUK: Yes, they come there
to fish.

13 MS. DEGNAN: And that's
year-around?

14 MR. KOBUK: No.

15 MS. DEGNAN: Every year that you
know of?

16 MR. KOBUK: No.

17 MS. DEGNAN: Is it just the --

18 MR. KOBUK: Since the things
that's been happening in the Yukon with
their commercial fishing, it's -- it seems
like this year the river was more impacted.

19 One of the residents that live there and
fish -- has a camp there. He says at all
hours of the -- since we have a 24-hour
light -- daylight, he's been hearing boats

1 all hours of night coming into that area and
2 day. The concern -- the reason we wanted
3 this was to protect that river for both
4 peoples; and for me to go against what their
5 wishes are, I cannot do that because I
6 represent these two villages; and they put
7 their faith and trust in me to do exactly
8 that, and I would like -- we would like to
9 see it exclusive, just for the two villages.

10 When we wanted to open up a
11 commercial fishing, the Yukon area, the
12 whole Yukon area, even in the Bethel areas,
13 Chalista went against our opening up
14 fisheries just for pinks just so that the
15 village can have some way of making money
16 because in the villages jobs are limited.
17 There's just a school, Alaska Commercial
18 Company, and the Native store. It's hard to
19 get jobs, so we in the city, because the
20 only ones that tend to get hired first are
21 the -- their brothers or sisters or their
22 relatives; and the residents are always left
23 out of job opportunities.

24 And I know that St. Michael and
25 Stebbins -- it happens all over the region.
26 So, that was what -- our main purpose for
27 this -- this wasn't my proposal; it was a
28 proposal from both villages to say that the
29 proposal came from me was wrong. It came
30 from the villages of Stebbins and
31 St. Michael. We'd like to see it exclusive.
32 That's the only comment I have.

33 MS. CROSS: Are there any camps
34 in Kotlik that you're talking about?

35 MR. KOBUK: My Dad's sister's
36 son, he's living with a lady in Kotlik. He
37 inherited that camp when his dad passed away
38 recently. But we weren't trying to exclude
39 those that moved to the Yukon like --
40 because they have families and relatives
41 there in St. Michael. We weren't trying to
42 exclude those out of this pro -- the
43 proposal we had written because Stebbins,
44 they have relatives. And what we wanted to
45 do was protect them two rivers. But our
46 Native way of life doesn't stop anyone from
47 hunting or fishing if they want to fish, if
48 they have to survive.

1 MS. DEGNAN: If they're passing
2 through?

3 MR. KOBUK: Yes, for their
4 family. Because as Natives, that would not
5 be right; but we don't mind them coming,
6 hunting, fishing, but there has to come a
7 time when we have to protect the fish
8 because everybody knows the fish population
9 is dropping all over, and that's our main
10 concern, is just the fish, not the other
11 game.

12 Because people aren't the only
13 ones that eat the fish. It's also the bears
14 because of the amount of bears, the
15 population have grown. It's become even
16 more that we need to protect our way of
17 life. And the beavers also damming up the
18 rivers is causing a lot of the problems.

19 MS. CROSS: So, what I heard you
20 saying earlier was that because of the
21 problems that the Yukon River is having,
22 then the communities that did not in the
23 past go to the small rivers are starting to
24 come because of the subsistence fishing
25 closures in the Yukon?

MR. KOBUK: There's more of an
impact now.

MS. CROSS: For that reason,
because of the number of fisheries growing,
you guys wanted to protect the resource you
have?

MR. KOBUK: Yes.

MR. ENINGOWUK: I got -- this
proposal would give exclusive fishing for
Stebbins and St. Michael. I think the
proposal is good if -- to protect the fish
for those two villages. However, like
everybody else, I still wonder about the
other village -- villages surrounding the
Kotlik that may have used that area in the
past.

I don't know what it's going to
do to Kotlik if they do -- if they've

1 traditionally been using that river for
 2 fishing. The proposal would -- my
 3 understanding, would be an exclusive
 4 customary and traditional use area for
 5 Stebbins and St. Michael. I don't really
 6 understand how this would -- is going to
 7 affect other villages that surround those
 8 rivers, other people that use those areas
 9 for fishing like from Kotlik. Of course,
 10 that would be, to my understanding, would be
 11 if it's okay for Stebbins and St. Michael to
 12 have other people use it even though they
 13 have exclusive customary and traditional
 14 use. I could understand that.

15 But to restrict other people from
 16 using an area, I think --

17 MR. KOBUK: Madam Chair, can I
 18 address what he's trying --

19 See, the reason that we're trying
 20 to make it exclusive, the rivers that we're
 21 talking about aren't very good. Because
 22 like I said, the mouth -- as you go in, it
 23 gets even narrower than that. Charlie Lean,
 24 he's been there. He knows what I'm talking
 25 about. These rivers aren't very wide and I
 26 don't see any way how it would affect
 27 Kotlik, because the Yukon River -- where the
 28 Yukon people live is a hell of a lot larger
 29 and has a lot more streams and rivers, and
 30 they also have Pastolik River.

31 I see in no way by making it
 32 exclusive that we would hurt the other ones
 33 at Kotlik. It's like I said earlier, our
 34 main purpose is to protect the fish -- fish
 35 stocks whether it be king salmon, pinks,
 36 chums, cohos, silvers. And we're not trying
 37 to not let them fish if they have to fish
 38 for their families, but we want to protect
 39 those rivers. That's our concern, both
 40 villages, because that's the only rivers
 41 that we have that fish go up besides
 42 Golsovia, because it is up towards
 43 Unalakleet, which is halfway up toward
 44 Unalakleet. Since it's open water, we
 45 hardly go over there to fish. Whereas where
 46 we get to Pikmiktalik, St. Michael there is
 47 an island. If we get rough, we can go into
 48 other rivers for protection, creeks, not
 49 rivers, but creeks. Pikmiktalik is more

1 like a creek than a river.

2 MR. ENINGOWUK: Thank you. I
3 understand. I think you kind of clarified
4 it for me.

5 MS. CROSS: I think at this time
6 before he scolds me again, I think we'll
7 take a little break and then continue
8 afterwards with our discussion.

9 I'll call for a ten-minute break
10 at this time --

11 (Break.)

12 MS. CROSS: I'm going to move the
13 meeting back to order.

14 MR. KOBUK: Madam chair, I need
15 to clarify what I said.

16 MS. CROSS: It's now 11:00
17 o'clock. The meeting's back in session.

18 MR. KOBUK: I was asked about
19 Kotlik coming to use the rivers, the
20 proposal that was submitted by me. Since
21 the problem with the Yukon with their
22 closing up the proposal and their limiting
23 to subsistence fishing, I want to clarify to
24 everyone that it's starting to impact this
25 little river that we're trying to protect
26 for the two villages because the villages
27 are growing. There's close to almost 1,000
28 people in Stebbins, and there's over 500
29 people in St. Michael, and every year it's
30 growing because -- the reason we want to
31 make it exclusive was to protect those
32 little rivers, because with the problems
33 with fish that the Yukon is having, the
34 people of those villages want to protect
35 those little creeks. I shouldn't be calling
36 them rivers, because they're more like
37 creeks.

38 I was asked if Kotlik people --
39 this just happened this summer. Before
40 that, there was hardly any people from the
41 Yukon River were coming to Pikmiktalik, but
42 now this year it's really going to impact
43 those fish because we not only have humans

1 to worry about, we also have the beavers
2 which are damming up the rivers and making
3 the fish hard to go up to spawn.

4 That's the reason why we want to
5 make this exclusive, just to protect those
6 rivers.

7 That's all I wanted to clarify
8 because -- by me saying that Kotlik uses
9 these rivers, now it's more so this year
10 than it's ever been in the past because
11 before there's never used to come around.
12 But now they're starting to come around.

13 And, yes, there's been some --
14 people that used to live in St. Michael or
15 Stebbins, there's moved to the Yukon or
16 there's moved up North to Unalakleet or to
17 other villages, and the problems that
18 they're running into in their areas is now
19 starting to impact those little creeks there
20 that we're trying to protect.

21 So I just wanted to clarify that
22 to the rest, because we live there, and
23 we're dependent on the fish, and that's just
24 the way the villages want it. So that's
25 just the way I'm going to have to support
what there's want, because I can't go
against them because I'll only be hurting
them if I go against their wishes. And
that's not what I'm going to do.

MS. CROSS: I'm going to call Pat
back again. I've got a question for her.

MS. McCLENAHAN: Yes, Madam
Chair, Pat McClenahan.

MS. CROSS: My understanding is
that you had written a letter to all of the
communities that were listed --

MS. McCLENAHAN: 26 -- 24
communities, I believe it was. The ones
within the 150-mile radius. They're listed
on page 6.

MS. CROSS: And then --

MS. McCLENAHAN: And I sent the
analysis to about 95 entities in those
communities, including traditional councils,

1 Elders' councils, boroughs and nonprofits.
 And we anticipate more comments, perhaps at
 2 our council meeting, our Kuskokwim meeting
 that's coming up. So far, these are all the
 3 comments --

4 MS. CROSS: Were there any
 written comments or anything that went to
 5 the Yukon/Kuskokwim RAC?

6 MS. McCLENAHAN: The book that
 there's have will include the same thing
 7 that you have here. The analysis will be
 presented at that council meeting.
 8

MS. CROSS: And the only
 9 community that responded was Kotlik?

10 MS. McCLENAHAN: So far.

11 MS. CROSS: Any questions for
 Pat?

12 Because of what Kotlik said in
 their comments to you, is that going to
 13 decide the proposal that St. Michael and
 Stebbins want? In other words, are you guys
 14 going to vote against it because of what
 we're trying to do?
 15

MS. McCLENAHAN: Do you mean, "Is
 16 the Board going to vote against it?" I
 don't know how the Board is going to vote.
 17 They take all the information and they
 present it. Kotlik let us know that they
 18 used their area affected like I wrote in my
 analysis. And that's why --
 19

MR. KOBUK: They say they use it,
 20 but recently they they've been starting to
 use it because of what's happening in their
 21 area. Before, when there was a lot of fish,
 they never did come to that area.
 22 Pikmiktalik is not only Federal, it's also
 lands that are owned by the Native
 23 Corporation of St. Michael and Stebbins.
 And if the two villages wish to close their
 24 lands, then that would be their choice
 because their people own lands in that
 25 river.

MS. McCLENAHAN: With respect to

1 Kotlik, it's my understanding from what I've
2 reviewed that Kotlik has no fish camps in
3 the Pikmiktalik River group area. That
4 their use of the area is incidental to other
5 activities like moose hunting, berry
6 picking, food gathering.

7 MR. KOBUK: Our only main concern
8 is the fish. We're not -- if they want to
9 hunt for game like moose or ducks, geese,
10 they're welcome. Berry pick, they're
11 welcome. But our concern is the fish
12 itself, just the fish we're talking about,
13 the king, silvers, cohos. That's what we
14 want to protect.

15 MS. McCLENAHAN: Madam Chairman,
16 you also asked me a question about the
17 research that I did, and I wanted to clarify
18 that.

19 MS. CROSS: That was during the
20 break. I was asking her if she made any
21 personal contact with the individuals in the
22 villages.

23 MS. McCLENAHAN: I have not yet
24 done that. I am waiting or have been
25 waiting for comments from this first round
26 of the initial analysis in sending that out.
27 So, I have not yet made contacts, except, of
28 course, with the communities of St. Michael
29 and Stebbins. We've had teleconferences,
30 and we've had meetings. And so we have
31 quite a bit of information about that use.

32 MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chairman,
33 also, when we gave the charge for you, it
34 was for Stebbins/St. Michael period, at that
35 point a couple of years ago, remember when
36 they asked for the C and T. I think that's
37 when we started. I think you did a very
38 good job on your C and T determination. I
39 think that you have all the documentations
40 regarding that. I commend you for that.
41 And I think it's a definite direction for
42 closure on this and vote for it, and if
43 there's an issue, Kotlik can bring it up
44 from their end. Right now I'm in favor of
45 the St. Michael and Stebbins C and T

1 determination. Put closure on it. If they
 2 want to do it on their end, they can get
 3 their exclusive use. I think it should. I
 4 don't think it should be prolonged. If they
 5 want to contest it later, Kotlik wants to,
 6 they probably would, they'll do it at their
 7 end in their RAC committee.

8 Right now, you're saying things
 9 regarding Kotlik from another district.
 10 They're not even here to defend that. Right
 11 now you're defending Stebbins/St. Michael.
 12 We on the RAC just look at those two sites.
 13 Closure to it would be positive right now
 14 for accepting this proposal.

15 MR. ENINGOWUK: Madam Chair, this
 16 is my first time. The motion is to support
 17 the Proposal 44 recommended to the Federal
 18 Subsistence Board to consider. Is that your
 19 motion?

20 MS. CROSS: As submitted -- as
 21 submitted by Leonard.

22 MR. ENINGOWUK: I think we have
 23 had ample review. I call for a question.

24 MS. CROSS: The question is being
 25 called.

26 All those in favor of the motion
 27 signify -- as written by Leonard, signify by
 28 saying "aye."

29 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

30 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
 31 signify same sign.

32 Motion carries as submitted by
 33 Leonard.

34 Thank you everybody for assisting
 35 us with this.

36 MR. KOBUK: The new
 37 interpretation wasn't written by me. It was
 38 just Charlie Lean and I forgot who --

39 MS. CROSS: Richard Uberuaga --

40 MR. KOBUK: Drafted that. I want
 41 to thank Charlie Lean and the other person.

1 Both villages are grateful for your help in
2 this. I want you to know that we thank you
with all our hearts.

3 MS. CROSS: Okay. Ten.
4 Review -- wait a minute, I'm sorry. We were
going to be hearing about the halibut
jurisdiction. Bill Knauer.
5 I'm sorry Bill.

6 MR. MENDENHALL: Halibut
jurisdiction?

7 MS. CROSS: Halibut jurisdiction.
8 He needs to leave early.

9 MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Madam
Chairman, council members. I'm Bill Knauer
10 with the office of subsistence management,
and I'd like to brief you on the situation
11 relative to halibut and the Federal
Subsistence Management Program.

12 The Federal Subsistence Board has
received three proposals related to halibut
13 for consideration in the 2002 fishing
regulations. We are withdrawing our
14 deferring of these proposals from
consideration by the Board at this time
15 pending clarification of the Board's actual
jurisdiction and implementation procedures.

16 These proposals are generally
located in Southcentral or southeast Alaska,
17 but the issue of halibut is certainly one
that is of concern statewide.

18 The management of halibut is
governed by the International Halibut Treaty
19 and the Northern Pacific Halibut Act with
jurisdiction in the United States primarily
20 resting with the secretary of commerce.

21 Title VIII of the Alaska National
Interest Lands Concentration Act does not
supersede nor modify that act. At this
22 time, there are legal uncertainties
regarding whether the Federal Subsistence
23 Board can actually implement subsistence
halibut regulations. And if they can,
24 whether these regulations would have to go
before the International Pacific Halibut
25 Commission for their final approval.

Upon resolution of those issues,

1 the proposals that are dealing with halibut
2 will be re-examined for appropriate
3 processing and potential Board action.
4 Regulations for the subsistence harvest of
5 halibut are currently being developed by the
6 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
7 for Secretary of Commerce approval.

Those regulations, as currently
5 drafted, are more expansive than the Federal
6 Subsistence Board could adopt in that they
7 make provisions for the subsistence take of
8 halibut by Alaska Tribal members living in
9 nonrural areas.

I'd like to give you a summary of
8 the major provisions of North Pacific
9 Fishery Management Council draft
10 regulations. The persons eligible under
11 those draft regulations who subsistence fish
12 for halibut will be Alaska rural residents,
13 members of Alaska federally recognized
14 Native tribes in rural areas with a finding
15 of customary and traditional use of halibut
16 who have moved to an urban area. In other
17 words, tribal members that now live in urban
18 areas, and members of Alaska federally
19 recognized Native tribes in rural areas with
20 a finding of customary and traditional use
21 of halibut who live in an area that has
22 become or in the future becomes urban.

Under the North Pacific Fishery
16 Management Council Regulations as they're
17 currently drafted, the daily bag limit would
18 be no more than 20 halibut except that no
19 limit would apply in their regulatory Areas
20 4C, 4E and Savoonga and Gambell.

The legal gear for subsistence
19 halibut will be set in handheld gear of not
20 more than 30 hooks, including long-line,
21 hand line, rod, reel, spear jigging, and
22 hand troll gear.

No subsistence halibut could be
21 taken -- could be retained on a vessel at
22 the same time as commercial halibuts are
23 being retained. No subsistence halibut
24 could enter a commercial market and the
25 customary trade of halibut would be limited
to an annual maximum of \$400.

MR. MENDENHALL: What's the fine?

1 MR. KNAUER: That's the limit
2 that could enter -- that could be for
3 customary trade. It's not a fine as such.

4 MS. CROSS: Is it just monetary
5 and not for trade for other --

6 MR. KNAUER: That's the monetary
7 amount. I don't believe there's a limit for
8 the other.

9 MR. MENDENHALL: How are you
10 going to determine --

11 MR. KNAUER: Lastly, the North
12 Pacific Management Council anticipates
13 publication of the proposed rule for
14 subsistence harvest of halibut sometime late
15 this year with a final implementation in the
16 early spring of 2000. In other words, North
17 Pacific Management Council is shooting for
18 subsistence halibut regulations to be on the
19 books for 2002 fishing season.

20 MS. DEGNAN: I don't like to see
21 a dollar value placed on any of these
22 subsistence foods because they're not
23 subsistence -- they're not commercial and
24 subsistence taken only. What's the
25 rationale for putting a \$400 value on this
26 when we don't know what the value of the
27 dollar will be?

28 MR. KNAUER: I think that they
29 are concerned that too much halibut would
30 enter the commercial market under the guise
31 of subsistence. However, there will be
32 opportunities for folks, including the
33 councils, to comment to the North Pacific
34 Management Council when they produce their
35 proposed rule late this year. This is not
36 part of our system. This is what the North
37 Pacific Management Council is doing.

38 MS. DEGNAN: Is considering?

39 MR. KNAUER: Yes.

40 MR. MENDENHALL: Who set that
41 \$400. Who determines that \$400?

1

MR. KNAUER: That was developed
in a -- in multiple working sessions that
occurred in Anchorage and Southeast Alaska
with many Native leaders and organizations.

MR. MENDENHALL: Western Alaska,
right?

5

MS. DEGNAN: Our cost of, you
know, freight and gas and everything else is
so terribly high up here that it's not
getting any cheaper. Every year when you
have to replace your gear -- your equipment.
Sometimes it's treble what you paid for it
some years ago.

9

MR. MENDENHALL: I'm against the
dollar amount on any subsistence trade going
on for the simple reason that IRS can then
tax it, and that's why we never want any
dollar amount on any subsistence food,
berries, game, walrus, anything, fish. We
never had that problem. We basically use
subsistence food for trade for berries, like
if we have a bad berry season, we trade with
Shishmaref, that kind of thing. That's why
I'm against a dollar amount.

15

MR. KNAUER: When their
regulations come out, you should provide
comments of your concern to them.

17

MR. MENDENHALL: They wanted to
know how much money was -- in the '70s, each
house, equivalent to an income. Once we, as
Native people, started doing that, then that
would give the IRS or any taxation agency a
chance to say, "Well, you owe us so much."
There's no money involved. It's just
subsistence food. I think that's bad. That
would force us to go out and get more game
and fish just to pay the taxes. I mean,
that's what my thought is right now.

23

MR. KNAUER: This amount of \$400
is not the amount of subsistence halibut
that could be taken, but the amount that
could be sold.

25

MR. MENDENHALL: Not traded?

1 There's no differentiation regarding sold
2 and traded? Sold could also mean trade.

3 MR. KNAUER: What they're saying
4 is customary trade for cash.

5 MR. KOBUK: When you talk about
6 urban, you're talking about cities like
7 Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau. Would Nome be
8 considered urban?

9 MR. KNAUER: No.

10 MR. MENDENHALL: One of my boys
11 traded halibut for bread, for one loaf of
12 bread. That's for trade.

13 MR. MAGDANZ: Madam Chair, a
14 quick comment on definitions. I think the
15 Federal definition follows the State
16 definition, that is the exchange you
17 described is considered barter under
18 regulation. Even though we all call it
19 trade, technically it's barter. And when we
20 talk about trade in the regulations, we're
21 specifically talking about cash for food,
22 what we would normally think of as a sale,
23 but in ANILCA there was a provision, that
24 came in partially because of trap, the
25 customary trade, the sale of
26 subsistence-caught foods was to be allowed
27 under law. And so one of the challenges
28 that I know the Federal government and the
29 State have both faced is what amount of the
30 sale of subsistence goods should be allowed
31 in addition to whatever people take for
32 their own use or for barter. And that \$400
33 amount applies to this part of the take of
34 halibut that could actually be sold in the
35 market or sold to a friend. That's what the
36 \$400 applies to.

37 MR. MENDENHALL: But I'm against
38 dollar amounts.

39 MS. DEGNAN: So am I.

40 MS. CROSS: So there's no
41 differentiation as to what you can sell?

42 MR. KNAUER: I don't know what

1 other regulations might be being drafted or
2 how they might be modified.

3 MS. CROSS: It seems to me if
4 you're going to go into -- if you're selling
5 your subsistence-caught fish to gain
6 monetary value, that would most likely
7 happen with commercial type of buyers,
8 stores and our --

9 MR. MENDENHALL: Look what's
10 happening at Fish River. They're -- they
11 don't have a piece of paper, they're getting
12 arrested. You see them on the dossier
13 report, arrested for noncompliance or some
14 kind of gear or over limits. Supposedly,
15 it's probably not in the case, but it's in
16 the eyes of the officer, interpretation out
17 in the field. It's going to be hard for
18 that officer -- that determination trying to
19 have airline pilots carrying pistols, in
20 that regard. So, I have a very bad taste
21 when you put dollar amount on subsistence
22 trade because of the danger of taxation in
23 the future down the line on subsistence
24 foods.

25 MS. CROSS: When they're talking
about the bag limit would be no more than 20
halibut, is there a size involved with that?

MR. KNAUER: Currently, no.

MS. CROSS: You would consider a
little one as part of your bag limit?

MR. KNAUER: Uh-huh.

MR. KOBUK: Are you saying that
people that used to live in the village --
they live in Anchorage -- and they go back
to the village to catch subsistence food,
they bring it back to Anchorage to sell; is
that what you're saying in this report here?

MR. KNAUER: What the current
draft regulations that the North Pacific
Fishery Management Council has got would
allow an individual who moves to an urban
area and lives there -- say, let's say you

1 moved to Anchorage. You could come back out
2 here and fish for halibut. Under the -- if
3 the Federal Subsistence Board were to make
4 regulations, that wouldn't be allowed,
5 because you'd be a resident of Anchorage.

6 But by North Pacific Fishery
7 Management Council regulations, you would be
8 allowed to do it. That's why their
9 regulations are -- would be more expansive.

10 MS. CROSS: And when they mean
11 members of Alaska federally recognized
12 Native tribes, means that any Alaskan -- any
13 federally recognized Native tribe can come
14 up here and fish for subsistence or is it's
15 going to be specific for what region you
16 came from?

17 MR. KNAUER: Wow, have to go back
18 to your region.

19 MS. CROSS: Is that going to be
20 in writing or is that --

21 MR. KNAUER: This is just a
22 summary of what their regulations are.
23 Their regulations will be very detailed and
24 complete.

25 MR. MENDENHALL: Do we have that
in the pack? I'm trying to look for it.

MR. KNAUER: We don't have the --
they have not been completed developed yet.

MR. MENDENHALL: You're saying --

MR. KNAUER: What I'm saying is,
we're telling you what the process is and
where it is right now. They are in the
process of developing their proposed
regulations and they will put them out for
public review probably in December of this
year, and they will provide an opportunity
for the public to comment on those.

MS. DEGNAN: How long will that
opportunity be? 60 days?

MR. KNAUER: I don't know.

1 MS. CROSS: Carl, did you want to
2 say something? Carl Jack?

3 MR. JACK: I was involved in
4 providing staff support to the -- to what we
5 call the Alaska Native Health Subsistence
6 Working Group when I worked for ruralCAP,
7 and the goal of that working group -- say,
8 under the IPH rules, you know Fisheries
9 Management Council, only two uses of halibut
10 are recognized in Alaska, sport and
11 commercial. Subsistence was not recognized.
12 So, when there was an enforcement action in
13 Nelson Island when a commercial halibut
14 fisherman brought home a halibut that was
15 less than 32 inches, what we call a short,
16 there was an enforcement action against that
17 person. And that was the beginning when the
18 Council formed a Halibut committee to
19 address that issue, and the work was carried
20 on to the Native Halibut Subsistence Working
21 Group; and, again, the goal was to
22 recognize -- push for the recognition of
23 halibut as a subsistence food. So, that's
24 the historical background on this.

25 What the council did in their
deliberations in Sitka, they adopted this
proposed regulatory regime in the form of a
resolution to put it onto the ANILCA
framework, but in addition to provide a
tribal fishery. First time in Alaska.
That's what Bill Knauer said, this being
more expansive than the ANILCA provision
because of the tribal eligibility criteria.

So, as Bill said, this is not
under OSM, it's essentially being worked by
the North Pacific Fishery Management
Council, and as Bill said, I think their
goal is to put in place some regulations for
subsistence-take by this coming summer -- I
mean, next summer.

So, I think they're shooting for,
like, December whereby the Council will take
final action on the proposed regulations and
they will probably go through the
administrative procedures process to get
public comment on the proposed rule.

So, I just want to add that at
the start.

1

MS. CROSS: Thanks, Carl.

2

MR. MENDENHALL: Could we ask Bill, then, what the deadlines are for this process?

4

MR. KNAUER: Right now, we don't have any -- we haven't been told any specific dates or deadlines that they're operating under. Just that their goal, as Carl mentioned, is to have a proposed rule sometime late this year, and a final rule out sometime late spring of next year so that the regulations could be in place for next fishing season.

9

We don't have any specific dates or anything else like that. You will be provided -- as soon as we know anything more your coordinator will provide you any information.

11

MR. MENDENHALL: The reason -- the reason why I'm concerned about it on that is because of a lot of our people have gone down -- like 16 boats were purchased from Bristol Bay for Nome area alone, and they were basically for crab but they can gear up for halibut. It impacts Nome in that way for halibut fishing. They're developing, and they also are learning to use halibut for subsistence as well since there's no salmon. So it's taking the place of another fish that we don't have; halibut is kind of like substituting that protein for another protein. And also for trade.

19

I don't think our people sit back and just let things starve to death. We are trying to have means for supporting our families. The CDQ -- I think the villages from Yukon, we were surprised that a lot of boats went back after partaking in the halibut season. Maybe next year they may gear up for it more.

23

MS. CROSS: What I would recommend to the Council is to see the entire provisions of the draft regulations, and then if we need to, either have a special meeting on it so we can send in our

25

1 written comments or have a teleconference
2 where we can discuss it -- just that issue,
3 and then make our written comments then.
4 Because, you know, what we have is read-in.
5 I have a lot of questions. I'd be able to
6 read -- I'm sure every one of you would like
7 to read what it's about. We can make
8 comments at a later date once we see the
9 entire document. That would be my
10 recommendation.

11 MS. DEGNAN: I agree.

12 MR. MENDENHALL: The other thing
13 to enlighten, is some of these people who
14 took out loans over \$50,000 for boat for the
15 crab and salmon and perhaps salmon, I think
16 that jeopardizes our people up here that are
17 learning about the Norton Sound fisheries,
18 and plus our CDQ allocation, we'd like to
19 keep, not have other people come into the
20 area when our young people are starting to
21 learn about fisheries. I think we need to
22 be cognitive to that change of process of
23 our people learning to become fishermen.
24 That's what I'm concerned about. I don't
25 think we should close the door on that.

And I appreciate you bringing it
up, bringing it to our attention, or else we
never would have --

MS. CROSS: Thank you. Any more
questions or comments to Mr. Knauer?
Have a nice, safe trip back home.

MR. KNAUER: I'll be here all
day. If it went in to tomorrow, it would
have impinged on other commitments I have.
Thank you very much for your indulgence.

MS. CROSS: Review of fisheries
resource 2002, is that going to take longer
than half an hour?

Do we want to take an early lunch
and take it up, or do you want to start it
and then take lunch?

MR. MENDENHALL: Where are we
now?

1 MS. DEGNAN: Start it.

2 MR. MENDENHALL: No. 10?

3 MS. DEGNAN: Might as well start
4 it.

5 MS. CROSS: You guys want to
6 start it and finish it up after lunch?

7 MS. DEGNAN: Yeah.

8 MS. CROSS: Review of draft
9 fisheries resource management for fiscal
10 year 2002.

11 Ann, are you the one that's
12 addressing that?

13 MS. WILKINSON: No. No, I'm not.
14 Steve Fried is doing that.

15 MS. CROSS: Sorry. There are no
16 names as to who is going to present it.

17 MR. FRIED: Good morning, Madam
18 Chairman and members of the council. My
19 name is Steve Fried. I'm with the office of
20 subsistence management in the Fisheries
21 Resources Division, and what I'd like to do
22 today is discuss the 2002 Fisheries Resource
23 Monitoring Plan. This refers also to
24 studies that are funded under this program
25 to collect information on subsistence
fishery that can be used to better
understand and better manage the resources.
And the -- what is called the draft plan is
under Tab F in your books. I've also
provided three handouts. One of them
actually replaces a few pages in the draft.
There is an error in they that they had the
same study listed twice, a description of
the same study listed twice. This would
actually replace the description in the book
under 02-050 under page 6 with the actual
study that should be there, just for
information purposes.

The other two handouts I have
addressed is sort of a summary of the draft
plan, indicating the high points, and also a
summary that's called the status reports for

1 this area. And this actually has some
information on the studies that have already
2 been funded in the year 2000 and 2001. Some
of these studies have already been
3 completed. Actually, reports that are
available, most of these reports are still
4 going on. This just gives a summary of
where these studies are right now. In other
5 words, who is doing them and whether it's
completed, whether or not there's a final
6 report or some other report that would be
available, and just a summary of what's been
7 found today just for information purposes.

If you have questions about that
8 or want to discuss it later, I can help you
as much as I can.

9 Really, the only thing that the
Council really needs to take action on
10 during this meeting is this 2002 draft study
plan that's within your books. And what
11 this has within it is some summary
information on -- under the introduction on
12 page 1, starting there, as to what the
background of the program, how it started,
13 how studies are selected, what -- just an
overall view of how this program has
14 provided money for these studies. There's
some charts in there with the different
15 amounts of money that were provided each
year and what we see in the future.

16 There's a map that shows where
the studies are. There's some tables that
17 show the numbers of studies and dollar
amounts for this year -- for 2002 and how
18 it's distributed, just to give people that
are interested an idea of the entire program
19 within the State.

But, really, what you need to
20 focus on are the studies for your region,
which begins on page 10, and also there's --
21 there's also studies that are called
"Inter-Regional Studies," a study that might
22 be applicable to the whole state or to
several different regions, and there is an
23 explanation of those further on in this
report that begins on page 29.

24 Let me try to sort of take you
through this just give you a quick summary,
25 and I'll be here for questions.

Basically, I think it would be

1 easier to take a look at page 11. It's also
2 in your handouts. There's a map of this
3 area called the Arctic, Kotzebue, Norton
4 Sound area. It's covered by three councils,
5 this Council, the North Slope Council and
6 North Slope Arctic Council.
7 And for 2002, there were a total
8 of seven studies that were recommended by
9 the technical review committee for further
10 considerations. What happens is proposals
11 come in. They're very short, a page or two.
12 They're reviewed by the technical review
13 committee using grading factors that were
14 up, proposals that were in this region,
15 issues that have been identified by
16 Councils, agencies, or the communities' need
17 for information. If they pass that
18 criteria, they'd further look and see
19 whether or not the studies seem to be
20 technically sound. In other words, does it
21 really look like you can really do the study
22 and get the information you want. They look
23 at the investigators or organizations
24 proposing the studies to see if they're seen
25 to be qualified to do this work and they
also look to see whether these studies will
be contributed to partnerships and the
capacity for the communities and
organizations to make sure that this isn't
just a study being done by the agency and
the information is not going to flow down to
the actual users. This is -- another
important part of this program is the fact
we're looking for partnerships between
agencies and organizations and users and to
make sure that the information is actually
useful. We also look for local hire to make
sure that there's people within the local
areas that can benefit by working on this --
on some of these proposals and also get some
training and a better understanding of the
process.
So, all these things go into the
decision of what the technical review
committee makes out of the proposal that
also came in. These were the seven that
best met these different criteria that are
now before you that have been -- that -- the
review committee has asked that they provide
a more detailed, what is called an

1 investigation plan so they can actually give
2 a better idea of the study and how it's
going to be done.

3 MS. DEGNAN: I have a question.

4 MR. FRIED: If you look at the
5 map, the only studies -- there are only two
6 studies within this region. One is the
7 Pikmiktalik Salmon Counting Project.
8 Another one was Unalakleet Weir Feasibility
Study. There's information our studies that
are proposed may be in other areas within
the region that are under our Councils.

9 MS. DEGNAN: On the map you have,
10 TRC recommended on a couple of them and
some -- there's no -- are these dropped out
by the review?

11 MR. FRIED: Good question. There
12 were seven that came in and this map shows
13 which ones are recommended. If you take a
14 look at the tables on the next page, you can
15 see there were, out of these seven, there
16 are a total of four that are recommended.
17 And what happened is the other ones that
18 weren't recommended, the TRC had to make a
19 decision. What happened was they were
20 either withdrawn or they didn't receive an
21 investigation plan for this study.

22 So, Noatak Fish Counting Sonar
23 Project, the investigators decided not to
24 submit a plan. They didn't feel they could
25 get the work done.

MS. DEGNAN: It was a local
decision.

MR. FRIED: A decision by the
people who put that in.

MS. DEGNAN: How about for the
Unalakleet River?

MR. FRIED: It was a USGS study
for a river station. When the TRC saw this
proposal, they thought, Well, that's not
really -- doesn't really fit very well, but
what they'd be interested in, can this
information be used to see whether or not

1 it's feasible to put a weir in Unalakleet
2 River. So, they contacted the proposers and
3 said: "Why don't you get some partners and
4 rewrite the proposal, and when it comes in,
5 why don't you rewrite it as a weir
6 feasibility study?" The river gauging would
7 be one part of that, and there would be
8 other work done to see whether they could
9 decide whether it would be suitable for a
10 weir.

11 They did discuss this with some
12 other agencies, and they decided they
13 weren't interested in doing this. What I
14 found out Alaska Department of Fish & Game
15 already had some plans to do some site work
16 for weirs on the river. I think the weir is
17 going to get done anyway.

18 MS. DEGNAN: But not with these
19 dollars?

20 MR. FRIED: But not with these
21 dollars. There was a harvest hunter TEK
22 study for taking Arctic grayling in the
23 Kukpuk River in Point Hope. When the
24 proposal came in it was actually to do some
25 traditional ecological work and some
biological sampling, and the reviewers of
that got back to the proposers and said:
"We would be interested in first doing the
ecological knowledge work and then if it
looks like the places that are being used
are actually under Federal jurisdiction,
then we can consider doing some more work
and maybe some biological sampling," because
it wasn't very clear from that particular
proposal whether or not this river fit
within this program. And the proposers said
they would do it, but I don't know whether
they ran out of time, but they never sent in
a plan, and we tried to contact them several
times and were not able to do so.

26 So, there's no plan sent in. So,
27 basically the three -- the four studies that
28 actually had investigative plans submitted
29 actually fit within the funding guidelines
30 for this area, and they all fit the criteria
31 that were used in the first place to select
32 them so there really wasn't a problem with
33 saying, okay, the TRC is recommending to

1 funding them all. So, they were basically
2 the only studies there to fund.

3 MS. DEGNAN: So, it's a free for
4 all, really.

5 MR. FRIED: I don't understand.

6 MS. DEGNAN: The approach is free
7 for all, whoever wants a study from
8 somewhere can send in a proposal. This is
9 the kind of information we're looking for
10 for these certain streams and certain water
11 areas that are being impacted and we're
12 sending out a request for proposals for, you
13 know, doing these studies. Do it the other
14 way around rather than leaving it wide open
15 for the general public to come up with their
16 best imagination for doing a project in the
17 area.

18 What I would like to see is that
19 we have specific concerns about stocks and
20 river areas like that's been highlighted
21 with the Stebbins/St. Michael issue on
22 customary trade, that we should be looking
23 at our region and seeing an aspect on who
24 needs to have these studies and have them
25 for specific things and advertise for the
26 best groups in which to do them. That would
27 be my thinking, because if you leave it wide
28 open to -- you'll just wind up with just a
29 few -- all the dollars being spent in one
30 area by -- and only a few areas are studied.
31 Whereas you take our region, these are
32 issues that we need further information on
33 it and it's a wise way to spend our dollars.
34 Or this is information that's not available
35 to the Federal Subsistence Board or the
36 agencies that we agree that these are things
37 we need more information on, and then there
38 is areas that will come from the local
39 community saying that we do not think this
40 study is worth the while because you're
41 not -- we're the one that will give you the
42 information and we'll -- whatever reports
43 you come up with will not be valuable
44 because you haven't gained our
45 participation, because we've been studied
46 forever and those agencies that do the
47 studies are very typical, their information,
48 they only give out what they feel is

1 necessary. So whenever a community needs
2 information, there is no really -- what do
3 you call it? -- directory or storehouse of
4 information that they can get the
5 information from, or the researchers say,
6 "Well, that information is no longer valid
7 because we're -- you know, we've changed our
8 mind as to -- what do you call? -- the
9 validity of the study."

10 But I'm looking in terms of how
11 best can we get the information that the
12 Council -- the Federal Subsistence Board
13 needs to make decisions on that affect a
14 large, vast number of people. And I
15 question all these dollars going out and we
16 don't see the end result or -- they're just
17 gathering dust somehow.

18 MR. FRIED: I hear two concerns
19 that you raise. One is a very, very
20 excellent one too. The first one is, "How
21 do we focus the program on getting
22 information that we really need?" And
23 basically it's a very new program. 2002
24 will be the third year. What we've done is
25 go to all the Councils and we've asked them
26 to identify issues. If you look at --
27 there's that little handout I gave out. On
28 the third page, it actually says page 5
29 because I copied it out of another report.
30 There's the issues for this region for the
31 Arctic/Kotzebue/Norton Sound region. So,
32 all the proposers were people that were
33 interested in proposing. This is up on the
34 Web site. It's sent out to people and
35 agencies. This is the first thing that the
36 TRC looks at is the issue that the proposer
37 is going to address, is that something
38 that's been identified. Something that
39 would be very important is for the Council
40 to look these over and decide whether or not
41 there's some other issues. Some of these
42 issues aren't important any longer. So, I
43 mean, that's the way so far that we've tried
44 to address whether or not these studies are
45 important or not, and that comes in too
46 right at the proposal stage. If there's a
47 proposal that doesn't address this issue and
48 it doesn't really seem to fit within the
49 program, it doesn't get to the investigative

1 plan stage.

2 Another thing to do, this is
3 something that Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula
4 Council is asking for and we're working with
5 them to do, is they're concerned too that
6 the money -- the spending of money for the
7 studies should be better focused. They want
8 to develop a five-year plan to make sure
9 that it's being spent and at the end of that
10 period of time they actually get results
11 that also are useful. We're working with
12 them to try to develop a plan. It's just in
13 the draft stage. I'm hoping to get more
14 information on that at the Council meeting
15 in the next few weeks, the Bristol Bay
16 Council.

17 Other Councils consider whether
18 or not they think that's something useful
19 for them or if the issues and information
20 needs that they identify is sufficient to
21 direct the program.

22 MR. KOBUK: Madam chairman, I
23 have a question for him.

24 On Table 4 it says "local hire."
25 Are the local hires going to come from
26 Stebbins, or is St. Michael going to be able
27 to participate in this study on the
28 Pikmiktalik River?

29 MR. FRIED: Table 4?

30 MR. KOBUK: Table 4 on page 16.

31 MR. FRIED: The investigators on
32 this one are Stebbins IRA and U.S. Fish &
33 Wildlife Service, National Parks Service.
34 There's some money within that -- basically,
35 this study here is actually a one-year
36 feasibility study to see if they can
37 actually find a good site to put a weir in.
38 The people that would be hired, it would
39 depend on how the investigators go about
40 that, if they would be from both villages or
41 how many people are interested and how many
42 positions there are.

43 MR. KOBUK: The reason that I ask
44 this question -- I know Stebbins had wrote
45 for this study to be done there, but the

1 reason I'm asking that is it would be nice
2 to involve St. Michael because we would like
3 to know Stebbins -- I guess we can get with
4 Stebbins --

5 MR. FRIED: We encourage
6 everybody to work together if they can.
7 Actually, the study will be done on the
8 Pikmiktalik River. This year would probably
9 be a few trips on the river to get some
10 data, looking at the bottom, measuring the
11 width of the river, taking a look. Is it
12 big boulders or small cobbles, what the
13 water flow is, what the water flow is all
14 during the year because it needs to be --
15 they were talking -- first they talked about
16 a counting to you earlier. Now they're
17 interested in a weir. There's several types
18 of weirs that you can put in, including the
19 weirs that bend over a certain flow level.
20 For a weir to work properly -- there's
21 certain things that can make it fail. One
22 is the bottom type, another one is the
23 debris loading the river. If there's a lot
24 of debris coming down, you have to clean it
25 a lot or the weir is going to wash out. If
the river is too high, the fish can actually
go over it if that occurs too many times of
the year.

Before the technical review
committee was comfortable in providing money
for a weir, they wanted to know what kind of
a weir so you can really figure out how much
money was needed. Hopefully, then it can be
operated by a local organization with local
residents. That's the idea for the future.
I would suggest you get ahold of Stebbins
IRA and try and work with them and make sure
you get included in that.

MR. KOBUK: It would be a benefit
for both regions to find out what kind of
stock is going on.

Charlie Lean, were you the one
that wrote Stebbins -- wrote this for this
study?

MR. LEAN: I wrote the initial
draft, but it's changed a great deal since I
did it.

1 MR. KOBUK: You wouldn't happen
2 to know if it's just going to involve
3 Stebbins only or --

4 MR. LEAN: I don't know. I would
5 say it's up to Stebbins. They are the
6 principal investigator.

7 MR. KOBUK: Okay. That was my
8 question. Thank you.

9 MR. FRIED: It's not too late to
10 work with them to make sure that, you know,
11 it includes both villages.

12 I helped Stebbins put it
13 together. The first time they put it in, it
14 was too short. So we kind of went back and
15 forth. We faxed things back and forth.
16 And, you know, they're listed as the
17 investigator. It doesn't mean that there
18 can't be some other partners in there.

19 MR. KOBUK: I guess we need to
20 talk with them and see if we can get
21 involved with it too.

22 MR. ENINGOWUK: That's the only
23 one in the region --

24 MR. FRIED: Yeah, this is really
25 the only one. I've had -- like I said,
26 there's three different Councils within this
27 region the way it's set out now for funding.
28 We've had a meeting with the North Slope
29 Council. What they decided to do was just
30 look at their studies within their region
31 and would decide whether or not they
32 supported the technical review committee
33 recommendations; and they did.

34 And so that would be one way to
35 look at it. You can look at all the studies
36 and make comments. Basically, the way it is
37 now, there's no other study you can say,
38 "Well, I like this one better than that one.
39 I'd rather have this." It's just whether or
40 not you agree with the selections or whether
41 or not you think some of these shouldn't be
42 in there because there's something, you
43 know, wrong with those; or, comments like

1 this, "Maybe another village should be a
2 partner on this." So, it's actually not a
3 very difficult decision, because there's
4 enough money to fund all three as long as
5 you feel comfortable that all three are
6 actually useful studies to do. If there's
7 one there that isn't, you cannot recommend
8 funding.

9 MR. BUCK: Madam Chairman, I make
10 a motion to support the 2002 Fisheries
11 Resource Monitoring Plan.

12 MS. CROSS: I can't hear.

13 MR. BUCK: I'll make the motion
14 to support the 2002 Fisheries Monitoring
15 Plan listed in Tab F.

16 MR. MENDENHALL: Second the
17 motion.

18 MS. CROSS: There's a motion to
19 support the 2002 Fisheries Monetary Plan and
20 seconded.

21 MR. ENINGOWUK: I just have a
22 question. Is the motion pertaining to our
23 region or all of them?

24 MR. BUCK: All of them.

25 MR. MENDENHALL: As far as -- I
26 agree with Peter, because there's no
27 conflict, and it -- that will be a base to
28 get started, and then hopefully on the
29 Federal level, and hopefully trickle it down
30 to the State level too to do studies. So I
31 think it's a plus.

32 MS. DEGNAN: I'd be more
33 comfortable if we supported the ones in our
34 region.

35 MR. MENDENHALL: I think as a
36 people just because we're different regions,
37 being supportive of the people in Western
38 Alaska, I think that would be quite -- it
39 shows our belief in their want for their
40 studies. And I think when we want to

1 help -- help from them, they would want to
support us. I think that's a courtesy thing
2 and diplomatic way to do -- for the RAC from
Seward. We may need help from the YK. We
3 might need help from Nenana and North Slope.
I think we should show a support for these
4 types of programs. In general, they started
on the Federal level Federal waters, and we
5 may want their support when it comes down to
State water down the line. We don't know
6 when or if. So I think -- I think it's
healthy to do this.

7
MS. CROSS: We're divided in
8 these three. They put us all together,
Arctic, Kotzebue, and North Slope.

9
MR. ENINGOWUK: Question.

10
MS. CROSS: All those in favor of
11 the motion, signify by saying "aye."

12
COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

13
MS. CROSS: All opposed, same
sign.

14
Motion carries.
Any further questions --

15
MR. MENDENHALL: Start on No. 11
16 now.

17
MS. CROSS: Let's go have lunch
now.

18
MR. MENDENHALL: We don't need a
19 lunch.

20
MS. CROSS: How long do you guys
want for lunch, hour, hour and a half?

21
MR. MENDENHALL: Hour and 15
22 minutes?

23
MS. DEGNAN: Hour.

24
MS. CROSS: We'll return at 1:15.
I'll call the meeting back to
25 order at 1:20, and we'll have Steve Fried
continue.

1

(Luncheon recess.)

2

MR. FRIED: The last item I'd like to try to review are the Inter-Regional Proposed Studies for 2002, and that begins under -- it's page 29 in that same Tab. Tab F on page 29.

5

MR. MENDENHALL: That has been taken care of already by his motion to --

7

MS. CROSS: No, these are inter-regional --

8

MR. MENDENHALL: I know, but he made a motion to approve all that by recommendation under Tab F as is, and then we -- she could go back to the record and see, see that motion.

Because he covered everything under Tab F, all the recommendations made for -- under Tab F.

MS. CROSS: My understanding is just for the ones that are -- that addressed our region.

MR. MENDENHALL: What?

MS. CROSS: Just for the ones that addressed our region. Arctic, North Slope --

MR. BUCK: As was his motion made wasn't that correct, the recorder? Peter is here right now. He passed all the proposals under Tab F; is that correct?

20

MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah.

21

MS. CROSS: Arctic, Kotzebue, and Norton Sound region.

23

MR. BUCK: Yeah.

MS. CROSS: But not the regional overview, because we haven't heard about that.

25

1 MR. BUCK: I didn't include
inter-regional overview.

2
3 MS. CROSS: Thank you. It starts
on page 29. You can continue, Steve, thank
you.

4
5 MR. FRIED: I'm looking at the
tables -- tables on page 30. You have the
list of studies -- these are -- the studies
6 not only affect your area, sometimes the
entire state, sometimes entire area
7 together. There's five of these studies, in
this case. Unlike the ones for Arctic,
8 Kotzebue, Norton Sound, the investigators
are requesting more money than is available
9 for these, so the technical review committee
picked the ones that they thought were of
10 highest priority, and the most important
issues. So, this is an area where you may
11 or may not agree. If you don't agree,
there's other studies you might select to
12 substitute -- that are routinely selected.
You can agree with their decision, or maybe
13 you don't like any of them at all.

But I don't know what the easiest
14 thing would be. There's five studies and
all of the studies that were selected for
15 funding actually would have -- would
actually provide information for this region
16 also.

In Table 1, there's two stock
17 status studies that the technical review
committee is recommending. One is called
18 "Development of a General Method for
Calculating Sustainable Subsistence
19 Harvest," which is kind of a poor title.
What these investigators want to do is take
20 a look at changing the way in which salmon
escapement goals are viewed.

21 The State's management system for
salmon is generally based on obtaining a
22 certain number of salmon and then allowing
harvest of anything surplus to that. And
23 what they try to do is calculate the number
of salmon that produces what's called
24 maximum sustained yield which would mean the
largest number of salmon surplus to the
25 spawning escapements. And when they set a
goal which is usually range of value. If

1 they project or if they don't obtain that
2 number of fish, then usually what happens is
3 you'll see commercial fishing will get shut
4 down, sports fishing will shut down. And
5 then there's a question on how low you'll go
6 for the number of spawners before you start
7 shutting down subsistence fishing.

8 Obviously the sustained level is
9 something you don't need for subsistence
10 fisheries. What you do is take a look at a
11 few ideas in how you obtain different
12 numbers and work with other groups
13 throughout the State, and try to get a look
14 at how to manage fisheries without relying
15 on maximum sustainable yield. That's sort
16 of the idea behind that study.

17 The next study that was
18 recommended is this "developed shared
19 Arctic/Yukon/Kuskokwim database," and what
20 this would do would complete some work that
21 was begun in 2000 under this program to --
22 it was proposed by the Alaska Department of
23 Fish & Game. What they're trying to do is
24 collect all the information for the areas,
25 salmon, biological information on age and
26 size and sex ratios of catches and
27 escapements. All the harvest information
28 they have for both commercial and
29 subsistence fisheries, and a lot of this
30 information is still not in a form you can
31 put in a database. It's in people's
32 notebooks and forms in file cabinets. What
33 they want to do is inventory the data, find
34 out exactly what they have, take the data
35 and put it into a computer, and check the
36 areas and set it up where this can be done
37 in the future.

38 The ultimate idea is to take this
39 information and put it on a database so it's
40 available to agencies and the public and
41 organizations.

42 Like I said, they started this
43 work in 2000 and weren't able to complete it
44 because there was a lot -- they turned up a
45 lot more information than they knew they
46 had, now they're asking for money just to
47 complete this phase.

48 MS. DEGNAN: So, what species are
49 involved?

1

MR. FRIED: All the salmon
species, chinook, sockeye, coho, chums, and
pinks. Whatever they have for those
species.

4

MS. DEGNAN: And I know from
previous -- you know, they talk about when
they're doing assessments and trying to
count what's going through, a lot of times
the water, community hampers them from
seeing the stock. So, what do you do in
those cases, just guess?

8

MR. FRIED: Well, what this would
do -- they're not going to collect new
information for this one.

10

MS. DEGNAN: Take the old. They
should identify that there's no information
based on water --

12

MR. FRIED: Usually when they do
have surveys, they have comments.

13

MS. DEGNAN: That will all be put
in there.

15

MR. FRIED: It's my understanding
they're going to try to put all that in
there.

16

17

MS. DEGNAN: It would be.

18

MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chair,
that's what we discussed at that statewide
meeting in January, for this type of data to
be started at least and hopefully that
computer database would go to our Norton
Sound area.

21

So, I would be for the study in
regards to -- that the data is needed on
Federal waters, probably -- possibly down
the line, the State water studies would be
done too. It would be a complement, the
studies.

24

I make a motion to follow the
same recommendations as is given to these
interior regional overview proposals.

25

I so move.

1

MR. BUCK: Seconded.

2

3

MS. CROSS: There's a motion to -- you're talking about all of these without even discussing the rest of them.

4

5

MR. MENDENHALL: Because we did deliberate over this in January and last year too.

6

7

MS. CROSS: I think we can discuss it now.

8

9

MR. MENDENHALL: I'm making a motion for now -- after we hear him going over it again, we call for a question and that'll be the end.

10

11

MS. CROSS: Okay. The motion is made by Perry, seconded by Peter. All in favor, signify by -- never mind, we're going to discuss them.

12

13

MR. MENDENHALL: We're at the discussion point right now.

14

15

MS. CROSS: We're at a discussion point. Continue.

16

17

MR. FRIED: The third one up here that wasn't recommended is this taking a look at the mortality of fish that are caught in the sport fishery, so it's the fish mortality. There have been studies in the past to look at mortality of different species. There are concerns especially in western interior Alaska that there's a problem. There's some studies that don't get to the problem that occurred, including long-term mortality.

21

22

It was -- the technical review committee thought it might be good before we started funding more individual studies on this to collect all the information that's available within Alaska and other places, try to sort through and see what information was applicable to Alaska, and then convene a working group to look at the information, decide whether or not, yeah, we know enough

25

1 so we decide it's not a problem or decide
2 that, yeah, there's places here that there's
3 still questions about so we need to do more
4 studies, decide what sort of studies should
5 be done, where they should be done, and also
6 have some meetings in different regions to
7 discuss this also with the people living in
8 those regions. And, basically, this wasn't
9 recommended at this point just because there
10 wasn't enough money within this program to
11 fund it. Actually, the North Slope Council
12 said they'd like to see this funded. If
13 there is money in the program after
14 everything was funded that it should be used
15 to do this study. That's their
16 recommendation.

17 MS. DEGNAN: I would recommend
18 that we do have a study because there's a
19 large concern about the catch and release
20 mortality rate in the UK river, which is
21 subsistence, sports, and commercial. I,
22 myself have retrieved quite a few fish from
23 the bottom of the river that were not --
24 they were released, but they apparently just
25 died of something. I'm sure they were catch
26 and release.

27 MR. FRIED: From the commercial
28 fishery.

29 MS. DEGNAN: From the river
30 itself.

31 MR. FRIED: Is there a net
32 fishery?

33 MS. DEGNAN: We use all sorts of
34 things. There's no net marks on the fish.

35 MR. FRIED: A lot drop out from
36 nets. You didn't see net marks on these
37 fish?

38 MS. DEGNAN: I would just assume,
39 just as me, that they were probably caught
40 and released.

41 MR. FRIED: Yeah, it could be.
42 It's hard to tell.

1 MS. DEGNAN: There is a large
2 concern in the river of catch and release.

3 MR. FRIED: There's a large
4 concern -- when this came in as a proposal,
5 it talked not about just the mortality, but
6 also wanted to get into some of the social
7 aspects of catch and release fishing. The
8 technical review committee wanted to stay
9 away from that part of it and wanted to get
10 into more the biological part of the
11 mortality, because it was a lot easier to do
12 those studies.

13 MS. DEGNAN: Salmon return is
14 assumed that they're going to spawn.

15 MR. FRIED: Right.

16 So....

17 As I said, the technical review
18 committee didn't recommend it, not because
19 it was -- it wouldn't be good information.
20 It's just that they were trying to stay
21 within the particular budget. So, and they
22 thought these other two, in their opinion,
23 were -- you know, when they prioritized
24 them, were more important than that one.
25 Like I said, the Councils can decide that
they would like to see all three if possible
to get funded, might want to substitute this
one for another one, or maybe you didn't
like this one.

There's two other studies for --
in this Table 2 that would provide
information either on harvests or ecological
knowledge. Actually, what these two studies
do is they speak to making information
available.

This first one talks about a
geographic information system database
integration. What that is, it's a request
from the subsistence division of Fish & Game
to take the subsistence database, all the
information that they have about this, and
combine it with the habitat and fish
stream -- the anadromous fish stream --

MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chair, I
was at one of the fish board meetings and

1 they wanted that done as well. The State
2 Fish Board, they were looking at that. They
were in favor of it -- such a study.

3 MR. FRIED: Basically, the
4 anadromous fish stream database, it's maps
5 with information of where salmon and other
6 anadromous fish like char spawn, in each
7 identified river or creek or stream all
8 throughout the state. Habitat division uses
9 that when they do permits. There's certain
10 things, if you want to build a bridge, build
11 a road, work in the stream, take gravel,
12 it's a lot more restrictive if it's an
13 anadromous fish stream than if it's not.
What subsistence division would like to do
is take the subsistence division on harvest,
and all the other information and combine
that, basically pull up information on a
stream or tributary and find out not that
it's just anadromous, but also what kind of
fish, harvests and everything else involved
with that stream. It would just make that
information easier to find. It would be
statewide, for the entire state.

14 MR. MENDENHALL: Rather than
15 duplicating studies.

16 MS. DEGNAN: Now, the studies
17 that also were done were interviews with
18 people that were using those streams.
19 Because I recall being asked by -- when they
20 were doing different studies, years ago, how
21 many fish did I catch that day, and these
22 were people that were from the governmental
23 agencies in the upper part of the river --
24 going up our river and asking questions.
25 How do they know I was truthful, you know?
And then that becomes, you know -- is that
what you're looking at what crunching would
be?

MR. FRIED: Actually, I think
they did this for Southeast Alaska.

MS. DEGNAN: That information.

MR. FRIED: Some of it is that
information, harvest information from

1 counters, whatever the subsistence for the
2 State of Alaska collects.

3 MS. DEGNAN: I would find
4 consulting with the local government group
5 as to what the harvest and utilization of
6 the streams and find that more informative
7 than I would some study that went in and we
8 don't know what their parameters were in the
9 past. And I'd like to see alongside, you
10 know, of their studies a database be set up
11 where it has input from the local community
12 that uses that stream.

13 MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chair, my
14 stepson was involved with that, Dan Thomas,
15 out in that part of the --

16 MS. DEGNAN: I'm talking about
17 any study. Any study that was done --

18 MR. MENDENHALL: Which one?

19 MS. DEGNAN: Any.

20 MR. MENDENHALL: But see, they're
21 talking about putting that study database,
22 what they done early back then. Also --
23 what's her name that used to work for Fish &
24 Game, that girl -- anyway worked with you
25 guys.

26 MR. MENDENHALL: They do all this
27 data, make it available. When it comes down
28 to governing bodies that politically make
29 policy, that's something to draw from.

30 MS. DEGNAN: I'm talking about
31 the validity issue too is I would like to
32 see local input into that database, also
33 other than contracted for investigators
34 coming from outside that have -- I say
35 consult locate -- local consultation.
36 That's what I mean. That should be part of
37 the data.

38 MR. FRIED: I know a lot of the
39 studies that they do through this program
40 with interviews and stuff. We encourage
41 them to train local people to go out and do

1 the interviews and collect the information.

2 MS. DEGNAN: There should be a
3 place within that database that you have
4 that information in there too so that
5 whoever is reviewing the material to make a
6 decision can have a spectrum of different
7 pictures from a different viewpoint.

8 MR. MENDENHALL: And Kawerak has
9 done salmon studies on past studies, house
10 to house, families, on the salmon catch.
11 They've been doing that on an annual basis,
12 surveys regarding that.

13 What exactly they had, that study
14 that Kawerak did, that's training of their
15 own people, our people. It's there. I
16 mean, the capabilities are there. It's just
17 a matter of how the contracting is done, how
18 the funding is available.

19 MS. CROSS: The information that
20 would be put on there would not be limited
21 to just the two sources. We'll utilize
22 other studies being done by other entities,
23 perhaps.

24 MR. FRIED: If the information is
25 available -- has been made available to the
State Subsistence Division and they have it,
then it would be on here. I'm just not sure
what information they've already got in
their subsistence fisheries database.

MS. DEGNAN: Simple statement,
not available, data not available can be
entered in, that sort of thing.

MR. FRIED: I know part of the
project would be to go out -- I know when
they did this in Southeast, they met with
the organized village of Kake and some other
villages to get their input and show them
what they were developing and trying to make
sure it was useful for them as well as an
agency. It's my understanding that they
will do the same thing with this statewide.

MS. CROSS: They're checking to
see if there's other data out there that may

1 be available for them?

2 MR. FRIED: I'm not sure this
particular project would do that. I think
3 this one would just be combining both the
databases and then once they're combined, to
4 write programs so you can actually query the
database, ask questions and come up with
5 maps and numbers. That might go beyond what
they're trying to do with this one.

6
MR. MENDENHALL: While they're
7 doing research for Kawerak, I asked for
fisheries -- data on fisheries. I got a box
8 full of data from the state library from the
department that high (indicating). That's
9 not even counting on the Internet what you
can pull off. There's a lot more data on
10 that. Actual hard copy from territorial to
'96 is what they sent me. I was doing some
11 research on that. What they're doing is
they want to empower that, put it on a
12 database that information already garnered
from the past to combine them with the new
13 ones. I think that deals with the new ones
is what the State Board has to deal with
14 their studies.

15 MR. FRIED: I'm not sure they're
going to be entering new information. I
16 think what they're wanting to do is take the
information that they've garnered in a
17 database and put it together with another
database, if you can put out the Nome
18 area --

19 MR. MENDENHALL: It's all there
on the State Fish & Game database.

20
MS. CROSS: You're just talking
21 about a one-year project?

22 MR. FRIED: One-year project to
do that.

23
MS. CROSS: Okay.

24
MR. FRIED: That's what that one
25 would do. The other project is another one
that was proposed by the division of

1 subsistence, and this one was to -- this
one, they were focusing on this one, Bristol
2 Bay, Chignik, Kuskokwim at first. The idea
behind this one, this Alaska subsistence
3 harvest timing, is that they wanted to be
able to pull data out that would show --
4 that would be able to come up with tables
and graphs that show the timing of
5 subsistence harvests in certain areas. In
other words, you could go there and you
6 print out a graph for an area for a harvest,
and you'd know that by a certain date people
7 might have 10 percent of their harvest. By
this other date, they might be 50 percent on
8 average, and you could also see what's the
latest they ever had half their harvest done
9 or all their harvest done, all this data. I
guess they do this anyway, anytime they have
10 to do it, they have to do it. If it's a
long time they have to do a manual and
11 they're looking to do this automatically
with a program so that they have that
12 information. Technical Review Committee
thought that integrating the subsistence and
13 anadromous stream databases was more
important than this project given the money
14 that was available, so they didn't recommend
the harvest timing, and they did recommend
15 the other one.

Those, basically, are the five
16 investigation plans that were before the
Technical Review Committee and before you,
17 and these are the three that were selected
by the Technical Review Committee. Anything
18 further?

I can answer questions if you've
19 got further questions. We can discuss this.

20 MS. CROSS: Well, we did have a
motion by Perry, seconded by Peter Buck.
21 Call the question?

22 MS. DEGNAN: Question.

23 MS. CROSS: All those in favor of
the motion by Perry, signify by saying
24 "aye."

25 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

1 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
same sign.
2 Motion carries.
Thank you.
3 Okay. The special action Unit
22, Donna Dewhurst.
4
MR. MENDENHALL: Are we going to
5 table this section --
6
MS. CROSS: We're tabling 22,
Southwest. That's the only area that
7 they're concerned about.
8
MS. DEWHURST: I'm Donna
Dewhurst, wildlife biologist of the
9 subsistence group. Kate Persons with Alaska
Department of Fish & Game. I asked Kay to
10 join me because this has been a long --
well, I wouldn't say a long, but it seemed
11 like a long -- all summer we've been working
on trying to cooperate between the State and
12 the Feds and Grace has been heavily
involved. Ken Adkisson has been heavily
13 involved with the Park Service, BLM, Jeanie
Cole has been involved. We've been trying
14 to get this coordinated. This is going to
be complicated. We're going to take it
15 piece by piece. We'll explain the history,
then we'll explain what steps we have to go
16 into next.
We have two things we're going to
17 have to do at this meeting. We're going to
have to continue a special action, so you'll
18 have to vote on how to extend an existing
special action on the Federal side, and then
19 I'm hoping that pretty much what we decide
from the special action will just roll over
20 into a proposal to make these regulations
into permanent changes. So, there's going
21 to be two things involving several different
areas in 22, and it is complicated. But
22 we'll try to take it piece by piece, and I
think the best bet will be to vote on it
23 piece by piece instead of trying to deal
with the whole package.
24 What might be best is if Kate
could give a short summary introduction on
25 how this started, what started in the
beginning of the summer.

1 MS. CROSS: We're going to be
2 tabling 22 Southwest, because there are two
3 people that are coming tomorrow.

4 MS. PERSONS: 22C -- D,
5 Southwest.

6 MS. DEWHURST: We can handle
7 everything but that. That's easy.

8 MS. PERSONS: For your
9 information, I prepared a summary on this
10 green paper about the -- what we -- the
11 information that we have about moose
12 populations in different parts of the unit.
13 I'm not going to go through all of this now.
14 I'm just going to focus on the particular
15 areas where we feel that currently
16 populations are declining and can no longer
17 support the harvest that is occurring in
18 those areas. And they are in Unit 22B west
19 of the Darby Mountains, so that includes the
20 area where White Mountain and Golovin is.

21 MS. DEWHURST: Tab G in your
22 book, page 6 has a little map that might
23 help while she's talking. You can refer to
24 that.

25 MS. PERSONS: Western 22B, and
that's accessible by the Nome road system,
and so it's hunted by people from the
villages of Golovin and White Mountain.
It's heavily hunted by people from Nome
because the road system provides access.
There are people from other parts of the
state and nonresidents who hunt in this
area. So, there's a lot of hunting activity
on a population that has been declining for
the last ten years, and recruitment in this
area is very low and current harvest levels
are higher than the number of moose that
are -- the number of calves that are
surviving each year to replace those that
are dying of natural causes. And so we feel
that we need to at least reduce harvest to
the level of recruitment so that at least
enough moose are being produced to replace
those that are being harvested out there.

1 That's one of the areas.
2 The second area is in the
3 Kougarok, Kuzitrin, and Pilgrim River
4 drainages in Unit 22D. There again, this is
5 an accessible area. It's on the Nome road
6 system. It's primarily Nome's hunting
7 ground. Really, there aren't any villages
8 that depend on this area that we know of to
9 a large degree. It's mostly a Nome area and
10 an area that's used by other Alaskans and
11 nonresidents. And it's pretty wide-open
12 country and access with four-wheelers is
13 easy. So, there aren't very many refuges
14 there for moose to hide in, and the
15 recruitment there has really declined in the
16 last three years, and the bull/cow ratio is
17 way down. And there we would like to reduce
18 harvest by about half.
19 And then the third area is
20 Johnson and Toby's area in Unit 22E where
21 there's not a whole lot of moose habitat to
22 begin with. There's a small resident moose
23 population, plus moose that move in from
24 Unit 22D in the summertime and we censused
25 the area this last winter, last March, and
 found that the population there is
 continuing to decline. It has been there
 for the last ten years. And a couple of
 things have happened there. We also did
 village harvest surveys at Shishmaref and
 Wales and we learned some very interesting
 things from talking to people when we did
 those surveys, and it seems that a number of
 years ago a lot of the moose-hunting
 activity was in the fall by boat, and at
 that time there were a lot of these
 migratory moose from Unit 22D, and the
 harvest was focused on bull moose in the
 fall. But as moose have declined in 22D,
 fewer, perhaps fewer moose are coming into
 22E, but in any case, people are having a
 harder time finding moose along the rivers
 in the fall and over the last -- I'm not
 sure how many years -- it seems that the
 harvest has shifted to the springtime and
 more moose are being taken in the spring
 because they're easier to find and in the
 spring people want cows because they're
 what's fat and that contributes to the
 decline of the small resident moose

1 population. And we worked with the villages
2 of Shishmaref and Wales and in both villages
3 people have knowledge of this decline and
4 were concerned about it, and we came up with
5 recommendations to shorten the season to
6 eliminate that spring harvest season, and to
7 eliminate the cow harvest. And so the
8 proposal that the State is submitting is one
9 that was worked out with the two villages.

I should -- let's see.

6 MS. DEWHURST: Do the emergency
7 order first.

8 MS. PERSONS: Emergency order:
9 Because we were aware that there were these
10 problems that were immediate problems, we
11 didn't want to delay taking action. The
12 longer you wait, you know, the more problems
13 you have and the harder it is to get back
14 onto firm ground. And so the department
15 issued an emergency order this summer
16 shortening moose seasons in all of these
17 areas; and then along the road system, we
18 felt that it was important to have the
19 season be the same everywhere with the
20 emergency order so that -- if the season
21 were closed in one place but not another, it
22 would just shift hunters to the open area
23 where the populations just can't withstand
24 any additional harvests. So we felt it was
25 important to do everything the same way
along the road system.

And with the State emergency
orders, the only thing that we can do is
shorten or close a season. We can't
establish permit hunts. We can't do vehicle
access restrictions. We have to keep it
really simple. We either close the season,
or we shorten it. And we had a series of
public meetings, and there was an advisory
committee meeting, and some teleconferences
and based on the public input we got, we
identified a three-week season for this year
that was August 20th to September 14th that
we put in and took place for this year along
the Nome road system. The emergency system
in 22E is the same as what we are
recommending for the permanent regulation
that we will ask the Board to consider in

1 November.

2 So, that's where we are right now
3 on the State side. For this year, in these
4 areas along the road system, it was just a
5 three-week season and the same everywhere
6 along the road system.

7 MS. DEWHURST: Then on the
8 Federal side, given that information, we
9 felt we had to take some action. We had to
10 do it quickly also. We -- as Kate
11 mentioned, the State has certain
12 restrictions in what they can and can't do
13 on these short emergency orders. The
14 Federal version of emergency orders is
15 called a special action, different jargons.
16 We have restrictions on special actions. If
17 we don't hold a public meeting to get public
18 input, we can only do a special action that
19 can only be in effect for 60 days. Because
20 we didn't do a public meeting here in Nome,
21 that's what they elected to do. The Federal
22 Board took action that very closely mimicked
23 what the State had done in most areas that
24 was only in effect for 60 days, so it only
25 went through September. So, now what we're
faced with is some of these hunt areas have
requested winter hunts or extended hunts,
and in order to extend those seasons past
the 60-day point, which is basically the end
of September, the Federal Board has to meet
again. After a meeting is held, and this
meeting basically counts as our public
meeting, after the public meeting is held,
the Federal Board -- as a matter of fact it
will be the staff committee meeting this
Thursday -- the Federal Board, I believe, is
meeting on Friday to make these decisions.
It's all going to happen rapid fire -- to --
whether or not to extend some of these hunts
into the winter and how to do that, that
sort of thing.

22 So, that's the first order of
23 business is we'll have to go through these
24 and on the ones we want to extend past
25 September, we have to then -- what we'd like
is the Council to make some sort of a motion
to say they support it or don't support or
whatever so we can give that information,
pass it on to the staff committee and the

1 Board. Because like I mentioned, the Board
will be taking action in short order.
2 That's the first aspect we have to deal with
is this special action, the continuation of
3 it.

And then once we get past that,
4 then Kate and I can talk about the next step
which will be permanent regulations that are
5 going to follow. Let's just deal with the
special action first.

6 What I'd like to do is go
actually West to East, which might be a
7 little bit backwards, we will skip 22 --

8 MS. CROSS: I'd like to see what
the State proposals are. Can we hand those
9 out, too, while we're discussing this so
people can see?

10 MS. DEWHURST: I think they're
more permanent to -- pertinent to the
11 permanent regulations.

12 MS. PERSONS: The blue page
describes what the State is proposing in
13 each of those three areas.

14 MS. CROSS: Just for information,
in Western 22B, it would involve
15 establishing two registration hunts with a
combined quota that wouldn't -- together the
16 quotas for those two hunts wouldn't exceed
our estimated annual recruit. Based on our
17 most recent data, that's 48 moose. So we
would have, first of all, a fall
18 registration hunt which would be -- we're
proposing from August 10th to September 23rd
19 with a quota of 42 antlered bulls. Now, if
those quota were reached before September
20 23rd, then the season would shut when the
quota was reached. And those dates were
21 arrived at as a result of both public
meetings in Nome and in White Mountain. And
22 at the public meeting in White Mountain, it
was expressed that August was a very
23 important month for people to hunt moose, as
was September -- actually, I should just
24 let -- Peter should speak on this. Don't
let me speak for you.

25

MR. BUCK: Okay. During the

1 meeting we went through this all over again,
2 these dates that you have here. They
3 were -- came from, I think it came from the
4 recommendation of White Mountain. In
5 October, first part of October is just
6 brief, we're stopped from moving, everything
7 freezes. It's dangerous to hunt during that
8 time. October and November, both months
9 are -- both months are very dangerous in the
10 White Mountain area. We have to be real
11 careful. And the September -- September to
12 the 23rd hunt, again, hunting in January was
13 hard from White Mountain. Then everything
14 froze, we can't go.

15 So, I agree with these dates that
16 they have here.

17 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, that second
18 part of it, the second registration hunt
19 would be in -- it would be for two weeks in
20 January, and there are a couple of ways that
21 we could handle that. It could either be --
22 if you can let me know which part of January
23 would be preferred we can set it in
24 regulation or we can leave it flexible and
25 it could be announced by emergency order.
26 We can just wait and see what the conditions
27 are and we could, like, request that now is
28 a good time to open it and we could open it
29 for two weeks. But there would be a quota
30 of six moose for this time period. And the
31 breakdown of the quota between these two
32 hunts was based on information that we had
33 from harvest ticket data and the subsistence
34 surveys that Kawerak and Fish & Game
35 conducted in White Mountain in 1999, and
36 based on what we know, six moose would
37 probably provide for what one could expect
38 to be taken during a January season.

39 And then the final part of this
40 proposal for the State is that we don't know
41 what the Board of Game is going to do as far
42 as eliminating the nonresident season from
43 this area. I mean, it would seem that the
44 data supports elimination of a nonresident
45 season, but we don't know what they're going
46 to do; and at a minimum, we're requesting
47 that if they retain a nonresident season
48 that it be by drawn permit only and based on
49 our current data not more than two permits

1 would be available for the nonresidents.

2 MR. MENDENHALL: This nonresident
3 are those the trophy hunters or what?

4 MS. PERSONS: It's people who do
5 not live in the State of Alaska, and they
6 are required to take bulls with 50-inch.

7 MR. MENDENHALL: I wanted more
8 definition of what you meant by nonresident,
9 Nome person or -- cannot go to 22B to get a
10 moose.

11 MS. PERSONS: Nonresident is a
12 person that does not live in the State of
13 Alaska. That's the State definition.

14 So, that's what we're proposing
15 for the long term.

16 MS. CROSS: In the interim period
17 I was going to have Austin speak about
18 Golovin. He was our contact person with
19 Golovin pretty much. Can you elaborate on
20 what information you got out of Golovin?

21 MS. PERSONS: Trade places.

22 MR. AHMASUK: Austin Ahmasuk,
23 subsistence specialist for Kawerak. I
24 worked closely with White Mountain and -- on
25 the emergency -- White Mountain on the
information that we did. Even though I did
a lot of work, it was White Mountain and
Golovin that did all the important work.
They had meetings in their IRA concerning
their emergency order and early closure.
And White Mountain Tribal Council did submit
a proposal for moose hunting to the State
system. In reference to the emergency
order, Golovin did also have an IRA meeting
concerning the early closure. However, they
did not go through the same steps that White
Mountain Tribal Council did regarding moose
regulations under the State system. They
did, however, express some interest in
making written comments to the Board of Game
concerning the early closure of the moose
season and possibly joining the White
Mountain Tribal Council with the proposal

1 that they submitted to the State.

2 They, however, didn't -- didn't
3 go through the same step as White Mountain
4 did in submitting a proposal. Their
5 proposal speaks to eliminating the
6 nonresident season and establishing a fall
7 season and a winter season. And I had known
8 that it was -- in villages across all of
9 Unit 22 that there needs to be two types of
10 hunting seasons, a fall season and a winter
11 season; but when looking and going through
12 the big game harvest surveys that we
13 conducted with Fish & Game, it became pretty
14 clear and quite quantitative that there
15 needs to be two types of season, fall season
16 and winter season. Generally speaking with
17 White Mountain and Golovin, the majority of
18 harvest occurs during the three-month
19 period, August to October with about 70
20 percent of the harvest occurring during that
21 time, the remaining 30 percent occurs
22 throughout the rest of the year until
23 February or so.

24 That's basically what I feel --
25 what White Mountain and Golovin want to try
and pursue and I sure was happy with the
work that they had done.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Austin.

MR. AHMASUK: Thank you.

MS. DEWHURST: Did their dates
correspond with the dates that were in --

MR. AHMASUK: They didn't
actually specify -- they did actually --
they did. White Mountain's State proposal,
Proposal 17, Unit 22B restrict to
subsistence hunting through the end of
October 2001. Then, again, their proposal
was in reference to the emergency order.
And I believe what you have here are these
Western Unit 22B Fish & Game recommendations
for moose. Those are regs that they
proposed on the state side. Here's the
White Mountain Tribal Council saying this is
what we want. Regardless of the meetings
that they had, I think you have to weigh
heavily what the White Mountain Tribal

1 Council has put forth.

2 MS. DEWHURST: Did they give a
3 winter season?

4 MR. AHMASUK: Did they give a
5 winter season?

No, they did not.

6 MS. DEGNAN: I have a question,
7 Madam Chairman.

When you talk about federally
qualified users, residents --

8 MS. DEWHURST: Residents of Unit
9 22.

10 MS. DEGNAN: The entire unit. So
11 I could go over there and hunt?

12 MS. DEWHURST: Right now there
13 are no restrictions. All residents of 22
14 have C and T right now, so they would
15 qualify.

16 Okay. So first order of
17 business, I was going to do -- since we're
18 discussing B, maybe it makes sense to go
19 back to B. We have to decide what we want
20 to do this coming winter for continuation of
21 the special action. If the Board passes
22 this, would this be good for this coming
23 January?

24 MS. PERSONS: Probably not. I'm
25 going to look into that.

MS. DEWHURST: Would you do an
emergency order if it wasn't?

20 MS. PERSONS: We wouldn't do an
21 emergency order, but if they were to pass
22 this regulation in November, they might be
23 able to implement it quickly in time for
24 that season to occur, but it's really
25 unlikely.

MS. DEWHURST: Okay. Well, that
will help.

MS. CROSS: Just a minute.

1 MR. SEETOT: Did the state of
2 Alaska decline a moose when they -- see --
3 did they see a decline of moose population
4 in the last census?

5 MS. PERSONS: Yes.

6 MR. SEETOT: The State, Federal
7 Government special actions if a management
8 plan is in place -- is there a moose
9 management plan in place by the State?

10 MS. PERSONS: No, we don't have a
11 moose management plan. That's something --

12 MR. SEETOT: I think you should
13 have foreseen that at least a year ago
14 instead of conducting emergency orders or
15 special action. It seems that we are -- we,
16 the residents haven't followed regulations.
17 I know that some do not follow regulations.
18 They don't report the harvest of big game
19 animals. Some don't even have a hunting
20 license, and the State doesn't have any
21 management plan for some big game species,
22 they have one for the brown bear, Northwest
23 Management Plan, something about the muskox,
24 they talk about that. Moose has been a new
25 species. I remember when I was growing up,
it was something that I never did see, but
it just came while I was growing up, and it
seems that consideration should be given
that big game species that is being depended
on by the residents, you should have a
management plan.

MS. PERSONS: I agree.

MR. SEETOT: A certain population
level goes to a certain mark, instead of
having emergency orders and special action,
you can just kind of follow the plan that is
being -- that -- what is approved by the
public.

MS. PERSONS: Point well taken.
That's a very good comment.

MR. BUCK: Madam Chair, I'll make
a motion to accept the Fish & Game

1 recommendations for moose regulations in
2 Western 22B.

3 MS. DEWHURST: It's not that
4 simple.

5 MR. MENDENHALL: I second the
6 motion for discussion.

7 MS. DEWHURST: Just for purposes
8 of discussion.

9 MS. CROSS: We'll go into
10 discussion.

11 MS. DEWHURST: What we need to do
12 first is the -- decide whether or not we're
13 going to have a moose season in 22B West
14 this coming winter. As you just heard Kate
15 say it's unlikely that the Board of Game can
16 enact anything that quickly. So, if we have
17 a winter season for this coming winter only,
18 that's all we're talking about right now.

19 It sounds like odds are it's going to be on
20 the Federal shoulders only. It's only for
21 Federal land 22B, BLM, land west of the
22 Darby Mountains. The question does come.

23 We therefore set a season, what the bag
24 limit is, which the bag limit will probably
25 be one bull; and then do we want to have a
26 quota, like in this, six moose. We might
27 want to go through this, total of six and
28 hunt's going down. We can do it with
29 Federal regulation permits. That's not a
30 big deal, since it's only our hunt only. If
31 you like what Kate has proposed here, we can
32 go with one bull, quota of six. The only
33 question is we'd probably have to set some
34 dates at this meeting so we can get them in
35 the special action. We have to pick some
36 dates in January that are going to go before
37 the Board. That would be what I suggest.
38 You can do whatever you want. I'm just
39 looking at what we have here. This might be
40 something good to work from. This is only
41 good for this coming winter. Keep in mind
42 what we're talking about right now would be
43 for this coming January. Or if you want
44 December, fine. We need to set some sort of
45 dates and a bag limit and a quota that would
46 go in the special action that would go into

1 effect this coming go-around.

2 MS. CROSS: Kate, was it -- did
3 you talk with anybody recently regarding
4 dates in White Mountain? Did you talk to
5 anybody Recently? I thought you talked to
6 somebody recently regarding our winter
7 hunting date.

8 MR. ADKISSON: No, Madam Chair,
9 Charlie Lean talked to somebody in Golovin
10 per your instructions and request. We
11 haven't talked to anybody to my knowledge in
12 White Mountain.

13 MS. CROSS: Were they talking
14 about dates?

15 MR. BUCK: They were talking
16 about January.

17 MS. CROSS: Like January 1 to the
18 end of January?

19 MS. DEWHURST: What was the
20 reason for this, Kate, for the January dates
21 to be floating, the January dates to be
22 floating?

23 MS. PERSONS: Well, when I asked
24 them about a winter hunt, they liked the
25 December and January. I asked them, "Well,
if it was only a matter of one month or the
other, which one would you prefer?" And
they said January would be preferable.

26 They really asked for the month
27 of January. Two weeks -- I guess, I was
28 trying to -- would both of -- with both of
29 these seasons, what we were trying to do is
30 estimate, realistically how long it might
31 take to reach this quota. Because we don't
32 really want to have to close it by emergency
33 order. We want the season to pretty much
34 reflect what a reasonable time might be to
35 reach the quota. And it seemed like the
entire month of January probably was longer
than it would take to reach the quota.

36 And I didn't specifically ask
37 them about which part of January they would
38 prefer, but in other areas where there are
39 these winter hunts, it's often the

1 preference of communities to leave it
2 floating, because you don't ever know what
3 the weather's going to be like and it might
4 be that the first part of January is just
5 terrible conditions and nobody can get out
6 to hunt.

7 But if the middle of January came
8 up and conditions still weren't good, we
9 could just open it back and it will go until
10 the end of the month. It gives it a little
11 more flexibility.

12 MS. CROSS: You are talking about
13 less than a month, less than a month of
14 hunting?

15 MS. PERSONS: Uh huh.

16 MS. DEWHURST: Keep in mind, this
17 further complicates it. The way the State
18 does business and the way the Federal
19 Government does business is different. Kate
20 was mentioning if they set this up, they
21 would have to do an emergency order to close
22 it. We wouldn't have to. We could set this
23 up, give out unlimited Federal permits, put
24 in the regs, when six moose have been taken
25 the hunt will be closed. We don't need
26 board action for that if we write that in
27 the regulations. We have to get a press
28 release or somehow get an action that that
29 hunt is closed. On the Federal side, it's a
30 little bit cleaner. If you want it for the
31 entire month of January, and say when six
32 bulls are taken, that's it. We can write
33 that in the regulation, when the six bulls
34 are taken, whether it's a week a month, or
35 whatever, it's shut down. All we have to do
36 is a press release telling people that hunt
37 is closed, probably try to notify the people
38 that have permits.

39 MS. CROSS: I'd like to ask
40 Charlie about your conversation with
41 Golovin, was there a preference of month
42 given regarding winter?

43 MR. LEAN: No, there wasn't.
44 Talking about hunting, versus boating
45 hunting. It was an understanding they would

1 have snow machines. We didn't talk about
2 dates.

3 MS. COLE: Do you have any
4 information on where the moose are
5 distributed in 22B West during December or
6 January?

7 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, they're
8 mostly going to be on state-managed lands.
9 Most of the Federal lands are up in the
10 hills, not entirely, but for the most part
11 and they're mostly out of the hills than
12 they are down on the river bottoms.

13 MR. MENDENHALL: You work for
14 who?

15 MS. COLE: BLM, Jeanie Cole.

16 MS. CROSS: While we're quiet,
17 maybe we should take another ten-minute
18 break and then come back.

19 MS. DEWHURST: Sure.

20 MS. CROSS: Okay?

21 (Recess.)

22 MS. CROSS: I'll call the meeting
23 back to order at 2:35, and we'll continue on
24 with Kate and Donna.

25 MS. DEWHURST: Basically, what
we're going to take up first here, which
would be the first thing we need a motion
from the Council on, would be the extension
of the special action for -- just for the
Darby Mountains. We need a season just for
this winter, most likely will be a Federal
season. We do it with Federal regulation
permits. We issue unlimited permits. As it
stands now, anybody in Unit 22 would be
eligible. Bag limit, likely, would be one
bull, and now the things that are up to you
folks are what you want the season to be, so
the parameters of the season, and the quota.

There was some discussion on the
break that six might be too low. Kate was

1 saying, based on the surveys, that that's
2 what you thought it could support. Is that
my understanding?

3 MS. PERSONS: The problem with
4 knowing what to do this winter, we don't
5 know how many moose were taken this fall in
6 this area, and it will probably be another
7 three weeks before we have the information
8 compiling the harvest data. We don't know
9 how many moose have already been taken, but,
you know, based on our most recent census
data, not more than 48 moose total should be
taken. So it's kind of hard to sit here
right now and say how many would be
allowable for a winter hunt.

10 MS. CROSS: There's another issue
11 that came up during some of the discussion
12 with White Mountain, the concern that if the
13 quota is real small there was a desire from
14 some people to limit their winter hunt to
15 Unit 22B residents only because there was
16 fear that if it's open to the entire 22,
then their winter hunters in White Mountain
and Golovin would have competition from like
residents at 22C. Because of such a small
number, there was a restriction on that to
residents of 22. And restrict that just to
the villages of White Mountain and Golovin,
just something for you to think about.

17 MR. MENDENHALL: Just on the
18 Federal level.

19 MS. CROSS: It can't be done on
the State.

20 MS. DEWHURST: We looked into
21 that after you had mentioned that a while
22 ago, and it would be darn near impossible to
23 do it for this coming season, to do it under
24 special action. We probably couldn't do it.
The Federal Board -- I'm hedging bets
here -- that's my understanding of the
Federal board. The reason I give is to do
that, we're basically going into what they
call an ANILCA Section 804 and it involves a
lot of legwork. We have to do a lot of
research into it, and we can't do a lot of

1 research if the Board has to act on Friday.
2 So, the reality of the Board
3 being willing to do that for this special
4 action, I would say is nil. Now it is
5 possible -- I'm sure the Board would
6 consider it when we write the permanent
7 regulations. If you want to write that into
8 your permanent regulations, the Board would
9 consider that aspect and there would be time
10 to do the research. But as far as for this
11 special action, I really don't think the
12 Board's going to be willing to take that up
13 just because there would be zero time to do
14 the research. It's a real touchy legal
15 issue to do something like that. If we get
16 into Section 804, it's very touchy. They're
17 not going to want to do it on zero data.
18 We're not going to have time to do an
19 analysis. All we're going to tell the Board
20 is tell them what you said. I want you to
21 know that's the reality. Certainly a viable
22 option for the permanent proposal when we
23 start talking about that if the Council
24 wants to write that into their permanent
25 proposal, they can't -- can. It isn't a
very viable option for the purpose of this
option.

15 MS. CROSS: Ken?

16 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson,
17 National Parks Services. While I agree with
18 what Donna says, if you try to limit the
19 winter harvest on public lands to
20 essentially two communities, what you're
21 cutting out is a potential winter harvest by
22 Nome residents. While some research would
23 be indicated, I would suspect that if you
24 just went to the existing harvest ticket
25 databases that the State has and looked at
when Nome residents harvest their moose, you
could easily make an argument that while
there may be some long-standing pattern of
Nome use in those areas, that's essentially
a fall harvest when they can get to the
animals via boat and by four-wheeler and the
road system; and on that argument, I think
if it was supported by the communities, you
could probably justify that tight a
restriction for now. And then you just have

1 to see if somebody from Nome would want to
2 challenge it. But having limited hunting
3 and their experience, it's tough to get to
4 some of those areas via snow machine, so
5 you're really talking about people in Nome
6 who probably have cabins and things and like
7 Council that can base out of there and
8 clearly those people have alternative
9 resources available to them and hopefully
10 have already been successful in the fall
11 hunt. So I'm not sure it would be as much
12 problem as has been suggested, but that's
13 just my personal take on it.

14 MS. CROSS: Thank you, Ken.

15 MR. BUCK: I call for a question
16 on Western Unit 22B, recommendations for the
17 moose regulations.

18 MR. MENDENHALL: Question called.

19 MS. CROSS: But we're not
20 finished discussing this.

21 MR. MENDENHALL: That's Federal
22 regs. He's doing State regs.

23 MR. BUCK: I'm talking about
24 State regs.

25 MS. CROSS: These ones, that are
our recommendation that you're approving
their recommendations that are made by the
State? You're referring to only this?

MR. BUCK: Yeah.

MS. CROSS: These are just
recommendations.

MR. MENDENHALL: He's making that
recommendation.

MS. CROSS: You mean for Unit 22B
only?

MR. BUCK: Yeah.

MR. MENDENHALL: He's calling for

1 a question on his motion.

2 MR. ADAMS: Madam chair, my take
on this is, if you're attempting to do what
3 Peter Buck is saying, you're adopting the
proposal that will go to the Board. There
4 are two issues there. If you would adopt
that as your special action, that would
5 essentially set up that harvest that's
indicated, I believe in there two weeks in
6 January with the bag limit of one bull and
quota of six moose and would become your
7 special action, then you'd -- you know,
putting this regulatory proposal forward for
8 the Board's consideration in May for the
regular fall hunt next year.

9 MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chair, I
10 think he's reading into his motion.

11 MR. BUCK: I'd just like to say
the way that Kate was saying that we don't
12 have the information on what the harvest has
been -- this limit for the winter hunt in
13 January should depend on what the harvest
has been in September. You're saying 48
14 moose, and if that limit is not met, then it
should be added on to the hunting.

15 MS. CROSS: What I'm saying is if
16 we make -- the way I understood the motion,
if you vote on your motion and if you
17 approve it, we're essentially making our
special action, so what I wanted to do as
18 your special action requested -- your
proposal, and then we can make
19 recommendations to the State, and there's a
"yes," we like the recommendations made by
20 the State -- done that last. That way we'll
take care of our business.

21 MR. MENDENHALL: I think he's
22 wanting to act on the State and then go and
deal with the Federal.

23 MS. CROSS: But these are just
24 simply recommendations.

25 MS. PERSONS: That's what our
current -- yeah, recommendation to the Board

1 of Game would be. Although I may
incorporate the idea that you just
2 suggested. These aren't cast in stone.

3 MS. CROSS: What we can do,
though, it seems to me that it would make
4 more sense if we make the special action and
then do our proposal regulation, and then I
5 can -- we can make a recommendation to the
State Board of Game that they adopt the way
6 the State is proposing, the State's
recommendation, that the State adopts them.

7 If we do it now, I think we would
complicate matters in the sense that it
8 would almost look like we made a special
action proposal based on these
9 recommendations.

10 MR. MENDENHALL: It seems like
all his motion is to say, "Yes, we agree
11 with the State regs and recommendations."

12 MS. CROSS: Can you say on your
motion --

13 MR. MENDENHALL: Then do another
14 motion to do the Federal. We're entitled to
make policy. All we're doing is saying,
15 "Yes, we agree with the state; only the
State" --

16 MS. CROSS: Our recommendation --

17 MR. MENDENHALL: The body, all
18 we're doing is concurring with them.

19 MS. DEGNAN: You endorse.

20 MS. CROSS: Can we do a special
action first, and then our proposal, and
21 then we can endorse what they're doing? We
can table your motion until it comes to it,
22 okay?

23 MR. MENDENHALL: We already
called question on the motion, point of
24 order, purpose was to make a motion
regarding State recommendations which has
25 been done and discussed to death right now.
That's why the question was called by his

1 village and his village is behind this.
They already had enough hearings on the
2 State side with Kawerak involved.

3 MS. CROSS: Perry, what I'm
saying -- I'm not saying that his motion is
4 wrong. I'm just saying can we table it
until we get done with our special action,
5 then the proposal, then we'll get --

6 MR. MENDENHALL: Point of order
is that he called the question already. He
7 called the question on the motion. You
can't do that to a voting member on the
8 Board.

9 MS. CROSS: I'm not saying put it
again. I'm just saying can we do it last.

10 MR. MENDENHALL: He called the
question on the motion, which means that you
11 need to deal with it.

12 MS. CROSS: What is the motion --
the Board's recommendation?

13 MR. MENDENHALL: You can't
14 question the question -- when he represents
that --

15 MS. CROSS: I'm not arguing that.
16 Get some point of order. I'm not rejecting
his motion. I'm saying can we just hold off
17 on it and then we can vote on it after we do
our special action on just this one, and
18 then make the proposal and then make a
recommendation to the State to adopt this
19 one that's recommended?

20 MR. MENDENHALL: His motion was
to be behind the State recommendation as is.

21 Now, to go further on, to go into
Federal, he would probably make another
22 motion to concur -- to further discuss that
action, on the Federal side. Meanwhile he's
23 proposing to stand where the State is coming
from because all the hearings they had with
24 Kawerak, Golovin, and White Mountain tribes.
I don't see we on the outside of that region
25 should argue with his question on his own
motion.

1 MS. CROSS: Never mind, we'll go
2 ahead and vote on the motion.

3 MR. MENDENHALL: Like he was
4 going to do something against --

5 MS. CROSS: We'll vote on the
6 motion but it's going to be understood that
7 it's only on the State recommendation 22B,
8 and it only pertains to the State. It has
9 nothing to do with the special action. This
10 has nothing to do with the proposed
11 regulation that you'll be dealing with on
12 22B on Federal lands. All in favor of Peter
13 Buck's motion, signify by saying "aye."

14 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

15 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
16 same sign. Motion carries.

17 We're going to do this one this
18 way. We're going to do the special action
19 first, the proposed regulation second, and
20 then if we need to make a recommendation to
21 the State of Alaska to accept the proposed
22 regulations that is presented by the State,
23 we will do that last.

24 You may continue with 22B.

25 MS. DEWHURST: Based on recent
discussions, what I would suggest -- this is
just my suggestion -- you can do whatever
you want. We can say bag limit of one
bull -- this is for the special action --
bag limit of one bull. You set the dates of
action. If you want to do it in January,
fine. If you want specific dates in
January, fine. Then we could say that the
quota -- that the combined harvest of the
combined State and Federal harvest for the
sub unit for this season will not exceed 46
moose. That way when we find out from the
State what's left, we can go with that.
Now, there is a gamble. There might only be
four left, or there could be ten left. It
would be a little bit of a gamble, but we
could write that language in so that when we
find out from the State how many of the 48
are left, that sets our quota for this

1 coming winter.

2 MS. CROSS: Can you explain how
3 48 moose came about again?

4 MS. PERSONS: Uh-huh. The 1999
5 census estimated that there were 800 moose
6 in this particular area in Western 22B, and
7 our most recent composition surveys last
8 fall found 6 percent calves. That's before
9 winter. That's not really recruitment.
Recruitment is I'm sure less than that.
It's a hard winter. But we're using that 6
percent fall percent of calves in the
population as the number of moose that are
being recruited into the population. That's
48.

10 MS. CROSS: And how many are --

11 MS. PERSONS: And over the last
12 ten years, recruitment in this area has
varied between four and eight.

13 MS. CROSS: How many are
14 typically taken out of Nome residents and
15 how many typically are out of White
Mountain/Golovin?

16 MS. PERSONS: The average harvest
17 in this area since 1994 was 64 moose.
And -- do you have that data, Jim? How much
of that harvest is from --

18 MR. MAGDANZ: No, I left that
19 sheet over at the office.

20 MS. PERSONS: I guess we don't
have the data breakdown.

21 MR. MAGDANZ: I'll get it before
22 the next break.

23 MS. PERSONS: I think it's fair
24 to say that it varies, some years a little
more of the harvest is by Nome residents and
25 some years a little more of the harvest is
by village residents. And then there's a
chunk that's by other Alaskans who don't
live in Unit 22, and there's -- I think an

1 average of four moose taken by nonresident
2 hunters in this area.

3 MS. CROSS: Thank you.
4 Thank you.
5 Donna?

6 MS. DEWHURST: So, there's
7 basically, four, possibly five points to
8 this. So I think everybody is probably in
9 agreement to say that the bag limit would be
10 one bull. So we would issue Federal
11 regulation permits for one bull per person.

12 We can say -- it's up to you. We
13 could say the harvest would be closed when
14 the combined State/Federal quota is reached.
15 We can say that, or we can go with the quota
16 of six. It's up to you. Then we have to
17 set a season. Then the last thing we want
18 to decide is whether or not you want to
19 gamble and put together to the Council -- to
20 the Federal Board that you would like it
21 restricted to residents of 22B only. So
22 that would be the last aspect.

23 So, I guess the first aspect, I
24 think everybody is probably in agreement
25 with the one bull. The next thing would be
whether or not you want that combined -- you
know, to go with what's left out of the 48
or whether you just want to go with six
moose.

17 MS. COLE: I'm Jeanie Cole with
18 the Bureau of land management, and on what
19 Donna is proposing as far as going with
20 what's left of the 48 quota, since we don't
21 really have any idea of how many moose that
22 is, you might run the risk of having a
23 higher number than that area can sustain as
24 far as harvest. So can you put like a cap
25 on that, Donna?

22 MS. DEWHURST: What we're saying,
23 once we know what the State harvest is,
24 which Kate thinks she --

24 MS. COLE: What if there's 20
25 left?

MS. DEWHURST: She's saying --

1 you're saying "on Federal public lands."

2 MS. COLE: Can we say it would be
3 a maximum of six or eight permits, or
4 whatever is left over the unharvested amount
5 of the 48? Maybe there's four left and it
6 would be four. If there's 20 left, it would
7 be eight. You see what I'm saying?

8 MS. CROSS: Overharvest in the
9 Federal lands, they may be concerned with
10 overharvest in the Federal lands.

11 MR. SEETOT: Is there any permits
12 issued by the Federal Government or other
13 agencies for moose?

14 MS. DEWHURST: Not right now.

15 MR. SEETOT: And then the State
16 would be able to know by number of permits
17 issued how many was turned in and how many
18 are still out there if they didn't report --

19 MS. PERSONS: For the harvest
20 that's already occurred?

21 MR. SEETOT: Uh-huh.

22 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, in about
23 three weeks we should have an analysis of
24 the harvest tickets that have been returned.
25 And as soon as the season for cows closes in
26 22C it's going to put out an advertisement
27 on the radio, in the newspaper, for people
28 to turn their harvest tickets in.
29 Hopefully, in about three weeks we can have
30 a pretty good idea of what was taken in this
31 area.

32 MS. DEWHURST: I guess the better
33 question would be, "What do you think
34 Federal public lands could sustain as far as
35 a harvest?"

36 MS. PERSONS: In January, there
37 aren't going to be very many moose on
38 Federal public lands.

39 MS. DEWHURST: Even if there's 20

1 animals left, chances are there aren't going
2 to be any animals --

3 MS. PERSONS: I should take that
4 back. If it's not that much snow, it could
5 be. It's driven by snow depth distribution.

6 MS. DEWHURST: My other thought
7 is maybe we shouldn't be worried about
8 Federal public lands. Moose are more mobile
9 than muskox. If you take some of these on
10 Federal land parcels, chances are -- it's
11 not like these are fenced-in boundaries. I
12 don't know. I'm just trying to think on my
13 feet here.

14 We realize this is a tough one.
15 We don't have strong recommendations to give
16 you on the front. We're winging this as we
17 go just as you are.

18 You could go conservative and
19 stay with six or eight or whatever, and have
20 with it and say that's the quota for this
21 year and with the idea that if it should
22 have been higher, there will be that many
23 moose available for next year.

24 MR. SEETOT: Grace, what about
25 the communities? Do they prefer caribou, or
do they prefer moose, or do they get, you
know, certain species during a certain
period, like during the fall, moose and then
during the winter, caribou?

MS. PERSONS: Maybe that would be
a good --

MR. SEETOT: Or is there a
preference for meat like this in the
communities?

MS. PERSONS: Maybe Peter might
know.
Peter?

MR. BUCK: Sorry, I was trying to
figure it out.
I'm sorry.

MS. PERSONS: Do people from
White Mountain have a preference for either

1 moose over caribou or caribou over moose?

2 MR. BUCK: I have to say that
3 their preference would be moose. I'd have
4 to say it would be moose instead of caribou
5 because -- yeah.

6 MS. CROSS: Johnson?

7 MR. ENINGOWUK: Kate, I have a
8 question. Let's say we put a quota of six.
9 However, when we find out this fall that all
10 the moose -- 48 moose have already been
11 taken, are we going to say if we put six on
12 a winter hunt that we are overharvesting an
13 area, or it doesn't make any difference? If
14 you reach 48 moose --

15 MS. PERSONS: If we've already
16 harvested 48 moose --

17 MR. ENINGOWUK: When you open the
18 winter season, and you say we add six more
19 to that and put a quota of six for a winter
20 hunt, are we going to say that we should be
21 overharvesting an area?

22 MS. PERSONS: I really feel like
23 from the information that we have that we
24 shouldn't be taking more moose than 48
25 moose. We shouldn't even be taking 48
26 moose, but -- but I also have a very strong
27 sense that we haven't -- that 48 moose were
28 not yet taken out of that area in Western
29 22B this year. I'm just about -- I'm 99.9
30 percent sure that there is room for some
31 additional harvest this winter.

32 MR. KOBUK: I have a question for
33 both the State and the Feds. Do you guys
34 take into account, too, about the bears
35 killing the moose? Will that be entered
36 into this, or is this just for --

37 MS. PERSONS: There are separate
38 proposals submitted by the Northern Norton
39 Sound Advisory Committee addressing bear.
40 That will be a factor. We do believe that
41 bear is a very significant part of this
42 recruitment party.

1 MS. CROSS: What I do know, too,
2 based on the correspondence that other
3 people named earlier, including yourself,
4 the correspondence with White Mountain and
5 Golovin, there is a desire to have a winter
6 hunt, however many that may be. I guess the
7 question is a number or....

8 You're not taking the six out of
9 the 48? It's just an additional number?

10 MS. PERSONS: Six would come out
11 of the 48. It would be 42 and 6.

12 MS. CROSS: Okay.
13 I guess my first question would
14 be -- to the RAC is, "Do we hold a winter
15 hunt in the Federal lands in 22B?"

16 MS. DEGNAN: Question.

17 MR. MENDENHALL: I would follow
18 the recommendation made by Peter if he has
19 any because he works with his tribe, and I
20 would report what he has.

21 MS. CROSS: Peter?

22 MR. BUCK: What the Federal
23 recommendations that they are --

24 MR. BUCK: I make the motion to
25 accept the recommendations presented by
Donna, the Federal regulations.

MS. DEWHURST: I didn't make one
single recommendation.

MS. CROSS: She didn't make any
recommendations. She was giving
suggestions. That's why I was asking do we
want to have a Federal moose hunt in the
wintertime on Federal lands?

MR. BUCK: I approve it.

MS. CROSS: Do we have a month in
mind?

MR. BUCK: It's in January.

1 MS. DEGNAN: One bull.
2 MR. ENINGOWUK: When in January?
3 MS. CROSS: Beginning of January
4 to the end of January.
5 MR. BUCK: Floating January.
6 MS. DEWHURST: We can't do
7 floating January for this year.
8 MR. BUCK: Depends on the
9 weather.
10 MR. ENINGOWUK: Would it make
11 sense to say January 1st through January
12 31st, and that would open up the whole
13 month?
14 MR. BUCK: Yeah.
15 MR. ENINGOWUK: Are we saying
16 that we're going to have a quota of six
17 moose?
18 MR. BUCK: This would depend on
19 what the State harvest has been --
20 MR. MENDENHALL: The 48?
21 MR. BUCK: Yeah.
22 MR. MENDENHALL: And leftovers,
23 to that six.
24 MS. CROSS: Six plus State
25 leftovers out of 48 -- I mean out of the 42.
Is that 42? From the fall hunt, leftovers
in the fall hunt to be included in the
winter hunt.
MR. MENDENHALL: Plus six.
MS. CROSS: Six plus leftovers
from the 42.
MS. PERSONS: Minimum of six.

1 MS. DEWHURST: That's regardless
2 of how many are --

3 MS. DEWHURST: But what they're
4 saying, the motion that was passed by the
Board, it would be six no matter what's left
and possibly higher?

5 MS. PERSONS: Uh-huh.

6 MS. CROSS: And then there would
7 be one bull.

8 MS. DEWHURST: Okay.

9 MR. MENDENHALL: They drop their
10 horns in December. It's going to be hard to
tell.

11 MS. DEWHURST: That's why we're
saying one bull.

12 MR. MENDENHALL: Come December
13 their horns are gone. They're up to their
armpits in snow. And then the guy shoots
and he found out it's a cow instead of a
14 bull in January.

15 MS. DEWHURST: That's always a
16 problem.

17 MS. PERSONS: Careful.

18 MR. MENDENHALL: You can't see
their ding-a-ling to say that's a bull.

19 MS. CROSS: Actually, the
existing regulation goes from December 1 to
20 January 31st, one bull. That's the existing
one. So it's always been one bull from the
21 hunt to January 31st. So we're just kind of
leaving it one bull, except the hunt is real
22 short.

23 MR. BUCK: Even with the -- not
24 being able to tell whether it's a bull, you
can't get close enough, wintertime, you
can't get close enough.

25 MS. DEGNAN: This hunt would be

1 federally qualified users of Unit 22B?

2 MS. CROSS: Do we have a desire
3 to limit it to residents of 22E -- federally
qualified users?

4 MR. BUCK: When I talked to
5 people in White Mountain they were -- they
wanted to limit it to the residents of 22B.

6 MS. CROSS: Okay. Except by
7 federally qualified subsistence users of 22B
only for the winter hunt.

8 So, can you read what we --

9 MS. DEWHURST: Okay. It would
be -- I don't have the exact wording, but
10 basically what we're looking at is a Federal
regulation hunt, one bull. I think I'm
11 understanding the season would be January 1
through 31, minimum of six, the -- the quota
12 would be a minimum of six, but possibly
larger -- this is where I'm going to have to
13 work on the wording, possibly larger if --
as long as the combined Federal/State quota
14 does not exceed 48. So it could get larger.
And it's limited to residents of Unit 22B.
15 So that would be the gist of it.

16 MS. CROSS: Do we need to add
17 federally qualified subsistence users for
that?

18 MS. DEWHURST: No.

19 MR. MENDENHALL: I call the
question on the motion.

20 MS. CROSS: The motion has not
21 been made for this specific one.

22 MR. BUCK: He just did.

23 MR. MENDENHALL: And you seconded
it. Did you -- one of us seconded. I call
24 the question. Because tomorrow we'll be
doing the 22D, I was just saying, I didn't
25 hear the motion. Apparently there's been a
motion, and I had -- we'll use Donna's
wordings to that, that would be a winter

1 hunt for Unit 22B.

2 MS. CROSS: All in favor of the
motion, signify by stating "aye."

3 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.
4

5 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
same sign?
Motion carries.

6 MS. DEWHURST: Okay. We got
7 through that. Now, we have to talk about
permanent regulations. In some respects
8 they might be simple. For your permanent
proposal which will be carrying these
9 regulations on after this winter we could --
we could do something along the lines of
10 what we've been doing with the floating.
The quota would be the balance of what isn't
11 used in the fall season. One bull, limit it
to residents of 22B, things would be
12 basically the same. The question would be
whether you want to stick with your January
13 1 through 31 or if you want it floating.

I guess that's really it. So, we
14 could say the balance would be, you know --
the total combined quota would not exceed 48
15 animals.

The only question, I guess, for
16 the permanent regulation would be whether or
not you just want to keep it January 1
17 through 31 or if you want a floating time
period which will coincide with what the
18 State sets up, which means we would have
to -- in order to do that, we would have to
19 designate that authority to somebody, which
will probably be BLM in Fairbanks, since
20 they're the primary land manager. We would
have to designate them to set the dates in
21 conjunction with the State, or do you just
want it January 1 through 31?

22 MS. CROSS: Peter?

23 MR. BUCK: I'd just like January
24 1 through January 31.

25 MS. CROSS: It sounds like it
would be exactly the same.

1 MS. DEWHURST: Except the minimum
2 of six wouldn't be. We would say the
3 balance of the quota.

4 MS. CROSS: What about on the
5 fall?

6 MS. DEWHURST: The only thing
7 different on the fall would be present
8 special action. Our present special action
9 is September 14, where the State is saying
10 February 23. That's an easy change. We can
11 change that. And why -- wait a minute. We
12 started August 1. You have to decide on
13 your dates. Our present special action was
14 August 1 through September 14. What the
15 State is proposing is August 10 through
16 September 23. That would be the first
17 decision you have to make is what you want
18 the fall season to be, and then if you just
19 want to go with the quota, the 42 antlered
20 bulls, then that would be an easy decision.
21 I guess the main decision would be the
22 season.

23 MS. CROSS: On the August 1st
24 date when we make the special action request
25 there was no consultation with the villages,
26 we had to do this in a hurry. The State had
27 an emergency order. We needed to align. So
28 the August 1st date was just picked out of
29 the sky, almost.

30 We wanted to have the subsistence
31 hunters headstart before the nonresident
32 hunters did for the special action request.
33 That's how August 1st came up.

34 MR. MENDENHALL: Let me ask
35 Peter. As to August 1 start for subsistence
36 hunt, would you figure September 15th would
37 be a good startup, and then after that three
38 weeks -- that's when the moose start really
39 moving around and about, come down from the
40 mountains -- that hunt was a subsistence
41 harvest, rather than August 1?

42 MR. BUCK: Tough one.

43 MR. MENDENHALL: What did Noah do

1 when he had to choose two animals coming on
the ark?

2

3 MS. CROSS: Kate, on the 22
4 recommendation, August 10th through August
5 23rd, that was discussed in your meeting at
6 White Mountain, right?

7 MS. PERSONS: Yes, it was.

8 MS. CROSS: Is it something that
9 people were extremely unhappy about or was
10 it something that people eventually --

11 MS. PERSONS: What was expressed
12 at that meeting was that August was the most
13 important time and early September was also
14 important, but towards the latter part of
15 the month the bulls are coming into rut, and
16 there was -- at least some people expressed
17 the opinion that they wanted to get the meat
18 before the bulls were rutting.

19 MS. CROSS: So, do we want to
20 have our first time coincide with the State
21 by State regulation permit for the exact
22 same dates except we could close our lands
23 for -- except by federally qualified
24 subsistence users and still keep it open for
25 the residents of 22 on just the fall hunt?

26 MR. BUCK: I'd say August 10th
27 through September 23rd.

28 MS. CROSS: Okay. So same time
29 period as the State.

30 MS. DEWHURST: We do that by
31 State regulation permit.

32 MS. CROSS: One bull. And
33 then -- except we need -- Federal public
34 lands are closed to taking a moose except by
35 federally qualified subsistence users.

36 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, we would
37 close -- the closure would stay in effect,
38 keep the dates, keep the combined quota of
39 42 antlered bulls. We could do that.
40 And then I'm thinking, after I

1 thought about that, I thought for this
2 winter hunt that we already just approved
3 on, because it is a combined State/Federal
4 quota, maybe we could state -- you could
5 hunt with either a State or Federal permit
6 on Federal lands. That way if they wanted a
7 Federal permit to be able to hunt longer,
8 different time period, that would cover all.
9 We could do that. That would be simple.
10 For the fall hunt we'll just say buy State
11 regulation permits so we don't have to issue
12 separate permits. Basically what you did is
13 you're saying you want it the same as what
14 the State has proposed here with the
15 addition of Federal lands closure?

16 MS. CROSS: Uh-huh. Okay.

17 MS. DEWHURST: I guess you will
18 need a motion.

19 MS. CROSS: For federally
20 qualified subsistence users only, which
21 includes the entire 22 in it.

22 MR. ENINGOWUK: I move.

23 MR. KOBUK: Second.

24 MS. CROSS: A motion has been
25 made, seconded.
26 Question?

27 MS. DEGNAN: Question.

28 MS. CROSS: All those in favor,
29 signify by saying "aye."

30 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

31 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
32 same sign.
33 Motion carries.

34 MS. WILKINSON: Who made the
35 motion?

36 MS. CROSS: Johnson made the
37 motion. Leonard seconded it.

38 MS. DEWHURST: We're not going to

1 go on with 22D Southwest. We're tabling it
2 until tomorrow, the Kougarok, Kuzitrin and
Pilgrim.

3 We don't have to deal with this
4 for the special action because nobody
5 requested a winter hunt here. So we have no
6 special action for this area that we have to
7 deal with, yeah.

8 We do need to deal with what we
9 want the permanent regulation to also say.

10 There again, we could go -- we
11 have the State -- what the State recommends,
12 you could go with that or you could come up
13 with something different.

14 MS. CROSS: And the one in the
15 book is wrong. The date on the 22D book is
16 wrong.

17 MR. MENDENHALL: 22, what?

18 MS. CROSS: Page 2, request for
19 special action date is wrong.

20 MS. DEWHURST: We went with
21 August 20 to September 14 is what we used
22 with the special action.

23 MS. CROSS: August 20 to
24 September 15 for the special action, and the
25 dates came from the town meeting in Nome.
We checked with Teller and
Brevig, and it's not their hunting area.
They said it belongs to Nome, if that's
correct.

26 MR. SEETOT: Along with the road
27 system. It's pretty hard for us to go up
28 there without use of jet units. Some people
29 make it on the waterside, but most prefer to
30 hunt closer to the community of Teller and
31 Brevig, I think.

32 MS. CROSS: And in both
33 communities, they said what Nome decides is
34 okay with them. In a town meeting in Nome,
35 Nome selected the dates for their -- for the
special -- I mean, for the emergency order
as August 20 through September 14th. That's
how these dates came up. We just adopted

1 what the State was, except we added, "except
2 by federally qualified subsistence users
3 only -- August 20th to September 14th."

4 Anybody has anything further to
5 add? Anybody from Nome?

6 MR. MENDENHALL: I'm a Nome
7 hunter and I kind of feel I experienced this
8 August 20 through September 14th. I don't
9 think that gives enough time for the bull
10 moose to move around for hunters from the
11 Nome area. I think maybe if we could move
12 it somewhat, you know down to like September
13 1st through -- what is it? -- three weeks?
14 Because this is our first cold snap this
15 week. That would probably drive most of the
16 moose down from the high lands to the
17 valleys and the flat areas. There's hardly
18 been -- when I went up the road on the last
19 day, there was hardly any hunters on the
20 Kuzitrin or 22D, up that way. You can count
21 like four cars only and that's the comment
22 that I have, and I don't feel that that
23 gives time for the moose to move down and
24 they're further away, and then enough cows
25 at that time. In fact, the cows are looking
26 for them.

27 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, because there
28 aren't any bulls.

29 MR. MENDENHALL: They're up high.
30 I kind of feel we need to permit next
31 year -- move it down for that two weeks
32 going to like September 1 to end of the
33 month.

34 MS. CROSS: I was going to say,
35 Kate, you can explain why these dates
36 occurred.

37 MS. PERSONS: Okay. In this part
38 of 22D, the bull/cow ratio has dropped way
39 down, 16 bulls now per hundred cows. So, we
40 really need to reduce the harvest of bulls
41 in this area. And what we're trying to do
42 is cut the harvest in half. And in the
43 past, the bulk of the harvest has been the
44 third week of September. This was kind
45 of -- this was an unusual year. It was warm

1 very late. It's still very warm. Many
2 years, though, it cools off somewhat
earlier --

3 MR. MENDENHALL: And frost comes
4 down and chases them down.

5 MS. PERSONS: You expect bulls to
6 be moving around a little more. For the
7 time being, our intention was to cut it off
8 before they're easy to hunt because we
9 really need to reduce harvest, and if we
10 allow harvest to continue into that time
11 when they are more accessible, even with the
12 quota, the quota may be exceeded before we
13 realize what's happened. Because in the
14 past a lot of moose have been taken that
15 third week in September.

16 And so, for the time being, until
17 we turn the situation --

18 MR. MENDENHALL: You mean by the
19 14th --

20 MS. PERSONS: By the end of the
21 23rd. We cut it off for the reason that we
22 really want to protect bulls and we really
23 want to reduce the harvest dramatically.

24 MR. MENDENHALL: To do one -- I
25 don't know what your limit is --

26 MS. PERSONS: 33 moose -- 33
27 antlered bulls, correction on this sheet,
28 correction.

29 MR. MENDENHALL: Why not consider
30 so many cows with so many bulls. That way
31 you can save some of your bulls to still
32 service the surviving cows rather than just
33 saying all bulls because you're targeting
34 only one part of the species, thereby
35 depleting the chance of the hunted cows to
36 mate.

37 If you do crashes of bull and
38 cow, you still have a surviving rate of more
39 bulls to service the cows.

40 MS. PERSONS: Recruitment in this
41 area is so low; we just cannot harvest cows.

1
2 MR. MENDENHALL: Take that 33,
3 instead of saying 33 bulls, you're not
4 shooting any cows; but if you do like 20
5 bulls and 10 or 13 cows, that may work a lot
6 better for survival of cows and the
7 remaining cows, out of the hundred you only
8 used 13, and then meanwhile you got 20
9 bulls, but you got 13 more bulls that are
10 alive and can service the cows. That might
11 be sexist in that remaining part.

12 MS. DEWHURST: You have to factor
13 in too, with the biology of moose, it gets a
14 little bit embarrassing. They have shown in
15 studies. One bull can service many cows.
16 You don't need a lot of bulls out there.

17 MR. MENDENHALL: I can understand
18 that too. I would like to see where you
19 have a balance, not just bulls, poor guys
20 are being shot. Meanwhile they're probably
21 not all getting serviced either.

22 MS. PERSONS: They probably are
23 getting bred. We do have enough bulls that
24 they are getting bred.

25 MR. MENDENHALL: All we need --

MS. PERSONS: To reestablish the
balance.

MR. MENDENHALL: Rather than
getting all bulls, that way you still get
your 33 moose, the moose overall. And I
think this is the danger of why we've
targeted so many bulls because where there's
no bulls now, I think we need to come up
with a balance for so many cows and so many
bulls.

MS. PERSONS: If we had good
recruitment, say in Unit 22C. We are
harvesting cows because we have good
recruitment. There's good calf survival,
and we have -- moose are right at carrying
capacity, it seems. We're close to having
too many moose for 22C. We're harvesting
cows. In 22D there are -- the moose

1 population is declining, and it's an area
2 that we believe can support a lot more
3 moose. So we don't want to be harvesting
4 cows there. Otherwise, we're going to drive
5 this population right into the ground.

6 MS. CROSS: I think she
7 understands there's a correlation --

8 MR. MENDENHALL: Of what?

9 MS. CROSS: Between if too many
10 bulls are cleaned out, it affects the female
11 population.

12 MR. MENDENHALL: I was saying
13 between the correlation of moose and bear in
14 that area, there's a lot more bear up there,
15 more than normal. In fact, there's more
16 bear when I went up there than I ever saw in
17 the 20 years that I saw. I actually go
18 there, and I live there and I see more bear
19 than I do moose. I'm used to seeing moose
20 going by my camp than I do bear. There's
21 more bear than moose.

22 MS. CROSS: Let's come back to
23 22D.

24 MR. MENDENHALL: The correlation
25 of moose and bear needs to be balanced. I'm
also saying that moose bull and moose cow
hunts need to be balanced.

MS. CROSS: Perry?

MR. MENDENHALL: That's my
statement.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Perry.

MR. SEETOT: Do you have a
percentage of the females that you so-called
count -- do you have an estimate of how many
are barren, the ones that can't produce
calves?

MS. PERSONS: No estimates
particularly -- specific to this area, but
in other parts of the state where they've

1 looked at that, they found that really very,
2 very few moose are barren. What happens is
3 they have calves, but they lose them very
4 early on. Moose have a reproductive
5 strategy where they tend to have a calf even
6 though they may not be in good physical
7 condition. A lot of ungulates are not like
8 that. They'll abort their calf or not get
9 bred if they're -- or not conceive if
10 they're not in good condition, but moose
11 have a different strategy. They tend to
12 have a calf and if they're in poor
13 condition, that calf may be born dead. It
14 may die very soon after birth, in this area.
15 Of course, predators are a big problem and
16 many calves are taken very soon after birth
17 or within the first month after birth. But
18 as far as we know, moose are producing
19 calves, but the calves are just not
20 surviving.

21 MR. SEETOT: Going back to what
22 Perry was saying, like if you harvested
23 females along with bulls, I think one of the
24 nonresident requirements is that they have
25 to have an antler range of so long. The
26 females are not looking for the young
27 immature bulls. They're looking for the
28 mature bulls that will prove through battle
29 between those two bulls. And I think that's
30 what you have to think about. Most of
31 nonresident hunters have a hunt, they'll get
32 antler measurement no less than six inches
33 or so. I think that's what the reproductive
34 female is going after, looking for the
35 strongest, the biggest. And most of the
36 nonresident animal type has been the big
37 mature bulls, and that's what hunters are
38 looking for.

39 MS. PERSONS: That's a real good
40 point and that's exactly what's going on in
41 this area, in Kougarok, Kuzitrin, Pilgrim,
42 last fall surveys. We could hardly find
43 what we call a large bull. And what happens
44 is that if they're absent, the cows
45 eventually tend to get bred, but initially
46 when they come into their first estrus, they
47 reject the younger bulls. They want the
48 larger bulls. If they're not present, then

1 they go out of estrus, come back in 24 days
2 later and may get bred then, or they may
3 keep coming into estrus until even December,
4 and eventually they end up getting bred even
5 if it's by a younger bull. As a result,
6 then the calves are born later and they have
7 less time, then, to gauge strength and
8 weight before the next winter and they're
9 less apt to survive.

10 MR. MENDENHALL: Normally, the
11 hunters of Nome won't shoot a great big --
12 one with three rack trophy, which are very
13 few. I think most of them are concerned
14 about putting something in their freezer,
15 and they would rather get one that's not
16 that big, little three-, four-year-old bulls
17 so that -- because they taste better and are
18 not tough. I think that that's a thing that
19 needs to be considered, what Elmer was
20 saying, that there is some precondition
21 things, the way hunters look at moose. And
22 I would see a big bull and I won't shoot at
23 it with a rack all the way down to his
24 knees. I won't shoot. I'll let it go, for
25 a younger one. I think there's preferences,
but I also think that we -- we're shooting
cows. We want cow meat too. We need to
consider a balance between bull and cows.

16 MS. CROSS: Frances?

17 MS. DEGNAN: Have you considered
18 replenishing the population by bringing --
19 transporting the ones that are having
20 trouble in the urban areas, bringing them
21 out, putting them out in the remote areas?
22 Transplant of some sort?

23 MS. PERSONS: Apparently, moose
24 don't thrive under their sort of conditions.
25 They're very faithful to the area that
they're accustomed to being in. Once they
-- somewhere between the age of one and two
they establish a home range, and they're
just -- they're very faithful to that home
range and it's been shown with collaring
studies -- three are some moose that do
venture out and go to new places obviously.
Otherwise, they'll never expand the areas,

1 but the mortality rates for those that do
2 move into another territory are much higher
3 than mortality rates for ones that remain in
4 their familiar areas.

5 MS. CROSS: Like I said earlier,
6 I do know that from the town meet that was
7 held and there were -- this room was full
8 when the town meeting was held to decide on
9 what the moose hunting that should be for
10 this region. These were the dates that were
11 selected by -- August 20 to September 14th
12 was the date that was selected by people who
13 were here at the town meeting. And I don't
14 know if there's -- I know Perry's unhappy
15 about it, but I would assume that if people
16 were unhappy with dates, even August 1 to
17 September -- what do we have? August 1
18 to --

19 MS. DEWHURST: It was September
20 14th --

21 MS. CROSS: No, we left it,
22 August 20 to September 14th. I would assume
23 that there would be some hunters that would
24 be here expressing their concern, and I
25 haven't heard any.

26 MR. MENDENHALL: When they first
27 started moose hunting, it used to be
28 September 1. Somehow it moved to August. I
29 think our people pushed for August 1 for the
30 simple fact that we were already out doing
31 salmon fishing, silver salmon fishing; we
32 were camping, that's how it got moved to
33 August 1. I -- in the late '70s, it got
34 moved to September 1. I remember those
35 times, the kids were in school. I think
36 there was -- we need to adhere to the fact
37 that when moose started -- season started in
38 this area was September or fall time,
39 September/October. I think it -- the way I
40 remember it, and Charlie might disagree or
41 whatever.

42 MS. CROSS: Charlie?

43 MR. LEAN: I'm a Nome resident.
44 I was present at that moose meeting, and my

1 understanding of what was presented to us
2 was that basically we all agreed to the
3 concept of reducing the harvest to half of
4 what it had been. We were presented with a
5 choice of having a longer season or a
6 shorter season, and as Kate pointed out, the
7 best time to hunt moose is the third week of
8 September. I think we all realized that,
9 but the chances of accurately predicting the
10 harvest by the manager is less when the
11 harvest is fast than when it's slow. So,
12 the risk to the hunter was that if we went
13 for a slower rate of harvest, an earlier
14 season, the manager would more accurately
15 guess the right number of the harvest. And
16 if we went for the peak time of efficiency,
17 the third week of September when the whole
18 harvest could be taken in a single week,
19 that would make the manager skittish and
20 they might miss the mark by quite a lot.
21 And being a conservative manager means
22 erring on the side of conservation. In
23 other words, taking fewer moose than might
24 otherwise be taken. I think a number of us
25 at that meeting were thinking that a slower
rate of harvest and a longer season were
better than a quick and possibly smaller
harvest. So that was the understanding I
had at that meeting.

16 MR. MENDENHALL: I remember when
17 you first came up and we talked about this,
18 how we moved it over to August 1st, because
19 the camps were already there and situated,
20 and people were able to get moose when it
21 used to be just when school started.

19 MS. CROSS: Austin?

20 MR. AHMASUK: Having pointed out
21 what Elmer and Kate pointed out about
22 displaced moose, and possible late
23 harvesting time, I think it gives an
24 advantage to bears, whereas previously under
25 all of our years hunting moose on the
peninsula here, you could probably point to
a recent increase in nonresident harvest or
a different kind of harvest than it used to
be, larger bulls and so forth. I can say on
my own, living here, I've seen a lot of

1 bulls taken from this area by people that
are not from this area, taking large bulls
2 during a time that is most opportune for
them, not opportune for people that are
3 struggling by on a wage-earning job here in
this area, where resources are expensive.
4 Having said that, I think that the State of
Alaska, that they don't have all of the
5 evidence that points to some of the decrease
in the moose population here.

6 The recruitment is low, but yet
we haven't heard that they're saying cows
7 are not being bred. Of course, they don't
have the resources even to study moose
8 intensely as I would like them to or maybe
they should. But there doesn't seem to be
9 any concrete evidence that calves are dying
of natural causes or that cows are not being
10 bred, or that cows are being bred and there
is a natural cause of death for these
11 calves, but I think that there is something
that you can point to, and you can -- we
12 have talked about it and conjectured some
theories that there is displaced breeding
13 occurring or can occur at least, and based
upon that scenario and how it might play out
14 here on the peninsula, you give all of the
benefit and all of the advantage to bears,
15 whereas under other circumstances it might
not be the case.

16 I see calving on the Peninsula
here that occurs over a wide time, when
17 there's snow on the ground, when the leaves
are turning green. That doesn't seem like
18 what I used to remember where calves, you
know, are born earlier, so forth. So, I
19 think there's some things that need to be
reconciled. I think that we should try and
20 study these things more. I feel that
nonresidents and Anchorage hunters, sport
21 hunters coming up here and have had a
tremendous effect on the moose population.
22

MR. MENDENHALL: I also think
23 that maybe that August 1 opening allows them
to do that. That's an opportune time for
24 them coming up. That's why I'm looking at
September, when it's not very good climate,
25 dismal weather where locals can get the
moose rather than nonresidents, outsiders.

1

MS. CROSS: Carl?

2

MR. JACK: Let me just say first that I'm really impressed by the effort of the two Federal authorities working -- attempting to work together. But in a daily -- a couple of days I'm going to have the unfortunate opportunity to represent the Chair on the staff committee when this proposal is going to be considered. And the following day on Friday, the Federal Board is going to take it up. In representing the Chair before the staff committee, I -- I look at that responsibility very heavily, and that is to manage for subsistence priority. That's what I'm going to be looking at. And if there's a -- and I believe the numbers provided by the State, for example, 22D, the take of 33, so long as there's a sustainable harvest. And I believe that hopefully -- and let me just say first that in representing the Chair before the staff committee, I give a lot of weight to the decisions of the -- what comes out from the Regional Advisory Councils.

But, I have -- in representing the Chair, I have to give that priority to subsistence users, not -- for example, not people -- if there's a conservation issue on the resource, then that's where the priority issues go. So, I just want to bring that out, that even though we have the numbers, that the priority issues be for subsistence users.

MS. CROSS: Thank you.

Currently the special action for Unit 22, that portion within the Kuzitrin River drainage, Federal public lands are closer to taking moose except by federally qualified subsistence users August 20 to September 14th. The State has the same date but for residents and nonresidents -- for residents, right?

Excepting, currently they have a September 1 to September 14 nonresident.

MS. PERSONS: Right.

25

1 MS. CROSS: Was that for a
2 limited amount of permits or --

3 MS. PERSONS: That was our
4 emergency order where we couldn't limit
5 permits, but our recommendation for a
6 permanent regulation, if the Board does not
7 eliminate the nonresident season, would be,
8 again, to have a drawing hunt, nonresidents'
9 hunt by drawing permit only, and that there
10 be only a maximum of two permits available.

11 But there's a very good chance
12 that the Board will eliminate nonresidents
13 from this picture entirely. But that's just
14 something that we can't know for sure.

15 MS. CROSS: I guess my main
16 question for the RAC is do we want to mirror
17 August 20 to September 14th for federally
18 qualified subsistence users only in the
19 Federal public lands and look at it again
20 next year to see if the numbers of moose
21 have increased?

22 MR. MENDENHALL: This thing is
23 misstated for 2002.

24 MS. PERSONS: Would go into
25 effect last year.

26 MR. MENDENHALL: I would rather
27 not see it for August 20th. I would rather
28 see it come later when it's accessible for
29 subsistence hunters to get moose. And
30 that's when they are moving about, September
31 1 to September 31st, you still have your cap
32 there, see? And that will be one month.
33 And I would like to see, perhaps, bull/cow
34 ratio rather than just one sex limitation on
35 bull for the simple fact that this would
36 help provide subsistence, make use of both
37 the moose situation, the moose and the
38 cow -- I mean the cow and bull rather than
39 being, say, just bull only. I'm looking at
40 subsistence purposes. And the whole month
41 of September would be used or even
42 mid-September to October 15th would be great
43 for one month. But you still have your cap
44 of your 33 moose. I believe that's what
45 you're looking at when you say 66.

1 When you say 33, I don't think
2 you're losing very much when you do that.

3 MS. PERSONS: Well, I don't know.
4 We discussed this pretty thoroughly with the
5 public at different meetings, and this is
6 what the public recommendation was.

7 MR. MENDENHALL: That was for
8 this emergency order.

9 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, that's true.
10 We'll see. We have an advisory committee
11 meeting next week that may bring out more
12 members of the public. As I said, this
13 isn't cast in stone. This can be modified
14 right up to the Board meeting. And so far,
15 most of the comments that I've received have
16 been very positive about this.

17 In fact, usually people only come
18 and see you when they've got complaints, but
19 I've had probably more contact with people
20 in the -- on this than on any issue, people
21 coming in and saying right on.

22 MR. MENDENHALL: You'll hear it
23 from me -- I think this movement is going
24 out among the community here.

25 MS. PERSONS: They need to come
26 and let me know.

27 MR. MENDENHALL: They just got
28 through finishing this, the 14th was just
29 only last week. There's probably a lot of
30 mumbling going on here. You're only going
31 back to that. Most of the time they see the
32 cows, so there should be a balance.

33 MS. PERSONS: Most people are
34 expressing the opinion that there really is
35 a problem out there and we really need to
36 address it and reduce harvest.

37 MS. CROSS: My recommendation to
38 the RAC is to adopt the special action as a
39 proposal. We can look back at it next year
40 to see if there's any changes, and by that
41 time we will have heard from the community
42 of Nome. They would have expressed as to

1 maybe they didn't like the dates and we
2 would have heard that by then. I have not
3 heard any complaints, and because of that,
4 my recommendation to the RAC would be to
5 adopt this. You can always look back at it
6 next year. By that time we'll have more
7 information.

8 MR. MENDENHALL: I think now is
9 the time. We've already experienced the
10 hunt already. He's looking at setting a new
11 one for 2002. That's what I'm commenting
12 on. We've already experienced 2001. It's
13 done and over with. And I'm saying that I'm
14 dissatisfied with it and I'm saying there
15 needs to be a balance between bull and cow,
16 for subsistence purposes.

17 MS. CROSS: I will entertain a
18 motion to adopt the special action.

19 MS. DEWHURST: Madam Chair,
20 before you do that, there would be some
21 problems there being -- directly. I just
22 wanted to point that out. The special
23 action request was an open hunt. What
24 they're talking about under the State's
25 proposal would be a State regulation hunt
26 with a quota of 33 antlered bulls where the
27 special action was basically based on a
28 different concept of an open hunt.

29 MS. CROSS: State regulation hunt
30 with quota.

31 MS. DEWHURST: What did we say,
32 combined quota. 33 bulls or 33 antlered
33 bulls.

34 MS. CROSS: Combined quota of 33
35 bulls. And then you want the dates to be
36 the same as the special action on August 1,
37 the one confliction.
38 August 20.

39 MS. DEWHURST: August 1 -- they
40 keep --

41 MR. MENDENHALL: That's the
42 State.

1 MS. CROSS: That's on Federal
2 lands, 22D.

3 MR. MENDENHALL: 22D on Federal
4 or State?

5 MS. CROSS: Federal. We don't
6 deal with the State at all.

7 MR. MENDENHALL: You're having
8 problems, and this problem again is what,
9 Donna?

10 MS. DEWHURST: The only issue was
11 that the special action was an open hunt
12 where what the State is proposing now is a
13 regulation hunt with a quota. That's the
14 only difference between what we had this
15 year versus what the State is proposing --

16 MS. CROSS: So, the proposal
17 would be -- the hunting dates would be
18 August 20 to September 14th, which mirrors
19 the State hunting, and the hunt would be
20 one -- it would be State regulation permits
21 with the combined quota of 33 bulls in 22D,
22 that portion within the drainage, and
23 Federal public lands would be closed to
24 taking a moose except by federally qualified
25 subsistence users?

MR. MENDENHALL: Elmer, do you
concur? It's your district.

MS. CROSS: No --

MR. MENDENHALL: I'm asking
Elmer, from 22D.

MR. SEETOT: I'm from 22D. I
hardly use that area east of the road system
to hunt moose. One is, I do not have a
jet-powered unit on my outboard motor. I
kind of stay away from that area. I will
hunt closer to the communities if the
seasons are open.

MR. MENDENHALL: Do you concur
with bull only? This is where we're setting

1 2002 policy, not -- we're already done with
2001.

2

3 MR. SEETOT: I would like to see
4 some sort of harvest of both sexes like
5 Perry was mentioning. You have some old
6 barren cows out there that -- displacing
7 possible bulls that can probably reproduce
8 with a female, but we do have an antlerless
9 season in December.

6

7 MS. PERSONS: December and
8 January.

8 MR. SEETOT: But that is only on
9 the west side of the system that we're
10 talking about.

11 I would see no -- I wouldn't
12 disagree with what you are proposing, but
13 like Perry was saying, times are changing,
14 the weathers changes. We don't know if
15 there's going to be a forest fire in the
16 year 2000. It might drive moose toward the
17 west. We might have new moose populations
18 from that area. And we just try to make
19 regulation, okay. Just because the moose
20 were there last year, I think they're going
21 to be there for this year.

22 Sometimes we don't take into
23 effect the changes that do come with
24 weather. That's one of the major factors
25 that get some of these hunters from hunting
moose during a certain period. They don't
want to deal with the rain or with the wet
weather. They prefer ideal conditions like
this which are becoming rarer for the months
of August, September.

26 August is a prime month, at least
27 August -- of course, August and September
28 would be prime months for harvesting moose
29 within our area, 22D West, west of the Nome,
30 Kougarkok, Teller Road system, but Grace did
31 call me concerning this special action on
32 22D east, and she asked me to be of some
33 assistance. I said if certain areas were
34 closed, then hunters that go after big game
35 will find other areas to hunt, and that will
kind of suppress moose population. It won't
solve the problem, but they will move to
another area. So, I think what you said

1 earlier, the seasons have to be consistent
2 in pretty much all the units instead of
3 restricting one area over another. We
4 don't -- you've seen overharvest, but that's
5 spread out -- we want to conserve the game
6 species and shorten the seasons.

7 But I'm not sure what the date --
8 the dates they were requesting would mirror
9 the State regulation, but like I said
10 earlier, Perry sees a problem with that
11 because the moose were still in high country
12 a couple of days ago, and when it starts
13 getting cold, I think they get down. That's
14 one of the things that some hunters look
15 for. I don't hunt unless the animals are
16 there, the conditions are right before they
17 harvest or get big game species. It's just
18 that our action -- not our action, but any
19 agency action is that they go from past
20 experience. They don't look at upcoming
21 factors, weather changes, the climate
22 changes. You know, they're slowly pretty
23 much one hour -- one month later. We had a
24 cold season toward June, which is rare in
25 our part. Our plants, our berries didn't
bloom during the time they were supposed to
bloom, and then we had a cold snap, so we
had to scrounge around other places for
plant products, for some species of
wildlife. You have to address accordingly,
and just seems -- just because it happened
in the past that we should follow that. I
think some changes need to be made like
Perry was mentioning, 2001 hunting season is
already gone, but they probably had -- would
have had more opportunity to hunt moose if
they were in the lower regions. Now it's
already passed, you know.

20 All I can say is that whatever
21 the wishes of the Council or members of this
22 Council want, I would support that.

23 Grace did contact me concerning
24 the special action on the 22D, and I said
25 I'd go with the comments made by individuals
or with the majority.

24 MS. CROSS: I kind of looked at
25 it this way. It is something that we have
to revisit next year or soon if the
situations change, maybe revisit it.

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Madam Chair, I
2 would like to amend it to where we on the
3 Federal side of it, be hunting -- hunting
4 from September 1 to the 31st for the purpose
5 of subsistence ability to get either a bull
6 or a cow that could be considered by the
7 Subsistence Board. I think that would be
8 conducive and probably spearhead and
9 acknowledge changes in the climate. And
10 then the need for subsistence people to
11 hunt. That's my motion.

12 MS. CROSS: There's a quota of 33
13 bulls.

14 MR. MENDENHALL: I think bulls
15 and cows.

16 MS. CROSS: So, if the 33 cap --
17 if the cap of 33 bulls happened during the
18 State season, then the Federal season
19 wouldn't happen, right?

20 MS. DEWHURST: Correct. Let's
21 say -- the State season is opening August
22 20th. If they take 33 bulls before the 1st
23 of September -- it depends on how we write
24 ours, we don't have to write the quota in
25 there --

26 MR. MENDENHALL: I'm making the
27 ratio between bulls and cows, not just --

28 MS. DEGNAN: Just have it as
29 moose.

30 MR. MENDENHALL: It's important
31 to differentiate.

32 MS. CROSS: He's saying he
33 wants --

34 MR. MENDENHALL: I want one third
35 cows, two thirds bulls or 50 percent bulls,
36 50 percent cows on Federal. A lot of people
37 won't make it up to some of those Federal
38 lands, but I think it's an acknowledgment to
39 subsistence needs, and I think that moose is
40 a subsistence food, both cows and bulls.

1 When we go out to fish, we don't just catch
male chums, we catch male and female chums.
2 That's an illustration there. That's what I
think is needed. I feel -- that's the way I
3 feel at this time, and it would be --

4 MS. CROSS: So your -- you would
be saying -- you're saying Unit 22D, that
5 portion within the Kuzitrin drainage, one
moose, Federal public lands are Federal
6 lands, taken except by federally qualified
subsistence users, if the dates are
7 September 1 to September 31st, it would
be --
8

9 MS. DEWHURST: Have to do a
Federal regulation permit.
10

MS. CROSS: Have to do a Federal
11 regulation permit with a combined of 33 --
they have 33 bulls.
12

MS. DEWHURST: I don't know how
13 we would --

14 MR. MENDENHALL: I want cows
involved for Federal.

15 The way it looks like, you know,
that would be -- that 22D, that's quite a
16 bit of Federal land in there.

The land bridge and --
17

MS. DEWHURST: You could just say
18 combined quota.

19 MR. MENDENHALL: That's quite a
bit.
20

MS. CROSS: What did you say,
21 Donna?

22 MS. DEWHURST: You can say a
combined State/Federal quota of 33 moose and
23 let it stand at that, and then let the State
object to it when it goes to the Board.
24 They always have that right. They can
present something different. If you can do
25 something right now, you can say a
Federal/State quota for 33 moose.

1 MR. MENDENHALL: For purposes of
2 subsistence.

3 MS. PERSONS: It should be
4 antlered bulls.

5 MR. MENDENHALL: On this piece of
6 paper -- what?

7 MS. PERSONS: On this piece of
8 paper there's an error on the second page.
9 It says 33 moose, under No. 2, second line.
10 It says "quota of 33 moose"; it should be 33
11 antlered bulls.

12 MR. MENDENHALL: I'm looking for
13 subsistence, September 1 through 31st and
14 they'll still have that cap for subsistence
15 purposes. It's not a game. It's
16 subsistence.

17 MS. CROSS: And that would be
18 taking of moose except by federally
19 qualified subsistence users.

20 MS. DEWHURST: Standardly, when
21 we've had a one moose hunt, we always add,
22 "no person may take a cow with a calf."

23 MR. MENDENHALL: I would agree
24 with not taking a cow with a calf. But I
25 would leave it open to both cow and bull.

26 MS. DEWHURST: September 1
27 through 31, one moose by Federal regulation
28 permit, it will be closed when we have a
29 combined State/Federal quota of 33 moose had
30 been taken. Federal lands are closed to the
31 taking of moose except by federally
32 qualified users and no person may take a cow
33 accompanied by a calf.

34 MR. MENDENHALL: That's my
35 motion.

36 MS. CROSS: There's a motion on
37 the floor.
38 Is there a second?

1 MR. KOBUK: I'll second his
2 motion.

3 MR. CROSS: There's a second.

4 MS. DEGNAN: Just a discussion.
5 It would seem to be consistent for declining
6 populations of moose --

7 MR. MENDENHALL: I can't hear
8 you.

9 MS. DEGNAN: If we're talking
10 about the declining populations of moose and
11 we change from antlered bull to moose on the
12 Federal -- for the Federal lands in 22A, we
13 do have a lot of Federal lands, so I would
14 expect that this Council would consider
15 possibly doing the same sort of action in
16 22A as you do -- did with this 22D,
17 pertaining to federally qualified users.
18 That's just a comment on my part in looking
19 at terms of how we have declining
20 populations on how the access to meat on the
21 table is considered, because as myself, the
22 only type of moose I ever see are the cows.
23 I never see the bulls, ever.

24 MS. DEWHURST: It's already
25 restricted to residents of 22A for moose.
For the winter hunt at least it is
restricted to residents of 22A only.

MR. SEETOT: Grace?

MS. PERSONS: Madam Chair,
Council, I just want to caution you that
when we're talking about declining
populations, the only way we're ever going
to turn it around is to increase the number
of calves that are born and survive. And
the way to do that isn't by taking cows, and
I realize that your concern is for
subsistence and meat on the table, and that,
you know, may be helpful this year, but when
you're looking ahead to years to come and,
you know, to what's going to be available to
future generations, it's just, you know,
really important to address the problem now
and try and get it turned around so there's

1 more moose for the future. And boy, the way
2 to do it isn't by taking cows.

3 MR. MENDENHALL: I have a comment
4 to your problem regarding this. You still
5 have the management tools of saying how many
6 cows should be taken and how many bulls, and
7 I think the Federal will say 50 percent
8 bulls, 50 percent cows, maybe one-third
9 cows, two-thirds bulls. That's the tool
10 that I think can be used. This is what you
11 say, 33 bulls, period. You already have
12 that measurement. That's a measurement
13 stake that you use. We can use the same
14 concept of, like, 16 bulls and 17 cows and
15 you still have that cap and people are being
16 fed. And right now it's keeping moose out
17 of subsistence family use, and I think
18 that's the most important part. Especially
19 when we don't have a store like AC here.
20 They need to have people to get out there
21 with their limited gas. When the gas has
22 gone up sky high, their equipment upkeep,
23 and they see a cow, they should be able to
24 shoot that cow and put --

25 MS. PERSONS: They can. They
can. They have a healthy moose population.

MS. CROSS: There's a portion of
22D that's really healthy. Nothing has
changed.

MS. PERSONS: They can do exactly
what you're suggesting because they have a
moose population that has good recruitment
and a good bull/cow ratio. There is a cow
harvest allowed there, and -- cow harvests
are also important in managing moose
populations in preventing there from being
too many moose for the habitat, and so in
the future I'd sure like to think that a cow
hunt will be justified again, but right now
when the population is just going down,
down, down, we need every single calf we can
get and calves come from cows. So....

MR. MENDENHALL: And those that
are going to be safe are going to be on
State land. We're talking about Federal

1 land.

2 MR. SEETOT: When you talk about
3 federally qualified users, are you talking
4 about the whole unit --

5 MS. CROSS: Can somebody show it
6 on the map? That's why we have the map.

7 MR. SEETOT: The way it shows
8 pretty much, most of this is from the land
9 bridge, and it's pretty far from the road
10 system. This regulation just pretty much is
11 just for Federal land. State can make those
12 regulations and say only bulls will be
13 harvested, and you can mirror the dates, but
14 the State can go with their argument that
15 you need the cows in order to produce the
16 calves, but you don't know -- we don't know
17 many variables.

18 How well the water affects -- how
19 well the forest fires affect the moose
20 feeding, how well other moose migrate.
21 That's one of the things that I was just --
22 the Nome, Kougarok Road does not have very
23 much Federal lands right around that area,
24 and then they would have to go pretty much
25 toward the lava beds or through the Kuzitrin
River with the jet unit which is pretty
rugged.

16 State can make the regulations
17 they re -- say, restricting just on the
18 harvest of bulls -- and 22D does not have
19 very much Federal land, and that's what
20 we're trying to make regulations for 22B
21 East, pretty much along the road system.
22 You can make your argument that, Yes, you
23 need cows in order to produce calves, but
24 you can differentiate between State and
25 Federal regulations just by certain words in
the season and the harvest. We can argue
about, you know, bull/cow ratio, cow/calf
ratios, you know, stuff like that. It takes
two to tango. While we're not out there
watching the animals, we don't know since
the last census was taken how many have
moved in. We're just playing with
estimates. And then that's a good tool to
look at, but actual observation would tell
the biologist otherwise, you know, that

1 there are larger numbers than they estimated
2 or counted from the last census. That would
3 just be two differences the State can
4 restrict, take a moose, bulls only on the
5 Federal side. They can say that, federally
6 qualified use, but it would have to be in
7 certain areas which are pretty rare in 22B,
8 and most of this is in 22D East around
9 Kuzitrin River, going around Kuzitrin around
10 the lava activity, rugged from my
11 experiences over that way.

12 MR. MENDENHALL: And it would
13 probably ensure a lot of subsistence users
14 success for getting meat on the table, not
15 for trophy hunters.

16 MS. CROSS: Jeanie?

17 MS. COLE: This is Jeanie Cole
18 with the BLM. I have a question for Donna.
19 Is what we're discussing right now an
20 extension of a special action or a
21 permanent?

22 MS. DEWHURST: This is the
23 permanent.

24 MS. COLE: This is going to come
25 before this group again in February?

26 MS. DEWHURST: Yes, it will.

27 MS. COLE: So there will be
28 another chance to discuss it with the
29 February meeting?

30 MR. MENDENHALL: I want to
31 introduce a change. Change process in the
32 government takes a long time, so I would
33 rather try to see subsistence users get a
34 head start in trying to look at changes. We
35 used to have cow and bull moose season. We
36 should help the subsistence user get into
37 that. That's why I'm concerned about it.

38 MS. DEWHURST: Madam Chair, do
39 you want me to repeat?

40 MS. CROSS: Did you have

1 something to say?

2 MS. WILKINSON: I was just saying
3 this might be a good time to take a really
4 short break.

5 MS. CROSS: You guys want to take
6 a break? It's already 4:15.

7 (Recess.)

8 MS. CROSS: I guess I will call
9 the meeting back to order. It is now 4:25;
10 and Donna, can you read the --

11 MS. DEWHURST: I'm ready to read
12 in relation to the motion. Federal
13 subsistence permit. One moose by Federal
14 subsistence permit September 1 through 31,
15 the harvest will be closed when they the
16 combined State/Federal harvest quota reaches
17 33 moose. Federal lands will be closed for
18 the taking of moose except by federally
19 qualified subsistence users, and the last
20 one would be no person can take a cow
21 accompanied by a calf.

22 MR. MENDENHALL: How many cows?

23 MS. DEWHURST: It's just saying
24 moose.

25 MR. MENDENHALL: One bull, one
cow?

MS. DEWHURST: It's just saying
one moose.

MR. MENDENHALL: I agree.

MS. CROSS: Is there a second?

MS. DEGNAN: I'll second.

MR. MENDENHALL: Was there a
motion already?

MS. CROSS: It's been seconded by
Frank.

Call the question?

1

MR. KOBUK: Question.

2

MS. CROSS: Question has been called. All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

4

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

5

MS. CROSS: All those opposed, same sign.

6

Motion carries.

7

MS. DEWHURST: I apologize. I found out we do have to visit this area for the special action, because of one of those glitches. If we don't revisit it the hunt for this area will automatically reopen. The action we took is only 60 days. What I would request is that the Council makes a motion to extend the special action for this region, keeping it closed for the remainder of this year.

12

MR. MENDENHALL: 2001, you mean?

13

MS. DEWHURST: Yes. 2001. The hunt -- let's see, what did the hunt say -- it's to January 31st, so the hunt would remain closed for the remainder of this regulation year.

16

MS. CROSS: 22D is this right?

17

MS. DEWHURST: See, what I'm saying is the special action is only good for 60 days. After the special action expires, we go back to the current regulations, and the current regulations go --

20

MS. CROSS: Record of decision has it from August 20th to September 14th.

22

MS. DEWHURST: Correct. But then once that expires, once that's over, you automatically revert back to our original regulations which would open the hunt back up until January 31st.

25

1 MS. CROSS: I see. I see what
2 you mean.

3 MS. DEWHURST: Unless we extend
4 that special action to keep it closed.
5 Basically it would be a motion to extend the
6 special action for this region to keep the
7 hunt closed until the duration of this
8 regulation year, until January 31st.

9 MR. MENDENHALL: I have no
10 problem.

11 MS. CROSS: Anybody going to make
12 a motion?

13 MR. KOBUK: I'll make that
14 motion.

15 MS. CROSS: Motion has been made
16 by Leonard Kobuk.
17 Is there a second?

18 MR. MENDENHALL: Second.

19 MS. CROSS: Seconded by Perry.

20 MS. DEGNAN: Question.

21 MS. CROSS: Question has been
22 called. All those in favor of the motion,
23 signify by saying "aye."

24 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

25 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
same sign.
Motion carries.

MS. DEWHURST: 22E, 22E will be
easy. The Federal and State has pretty much
been in consensus working with Wales. There
shouldn't be much discussion here. What the
State proposed was what our special action
originally said, the August 1 -- December
31st -- August 1st through December 31st,
there's no cap put on it, no quota put on
this one.

The only difference, there's only
one little teeny difference in that the
State is proposing the language to say one

1 antlered bull, with the emphasis on
2 antlered. Our current regulations say one
3 bull. I would recommend to keep our Federal
4 regulations as one bull. The only
5 difference is because we're dealing with a
6 December hunt some of the bulls will drop
7 the rack. If we change it to one antlered
8 bull, we're going to restrict subsistence
9 users. I would recommend we keep it as it
10 is so all you would have to do is extend the
11 special action until December 31st for Unit
12 22E for the special action.

13
14 MR. ANUNGAZUK: Will that include
15 the revise -- the hunt for 22E?

16
17 MS. DEWHURST: Right now it just
18 says that it's closed to Federal -- Federal
19 lands are closed to nonfederally qualified
20 users, which means that any user -- resident
21 of 22 could hunt in 22E.

22
23 MR. ENINGOWUK: For Federal
24 lands.

25
26 MS. DEWHURST: From the history,
27 I think there are very few outside hunters.

28
29 MS. PERSONS: 95 percent of the
30 hunters since 1994 have been by the
31 residents of 22E.

32
33 MR. ANUNGAZUK: There's been a
34 decline of bulls. I wonder if that's 22
35 revisited?

36
37 MS. DEWHURST: You can write that
38 in if that's what you want.

39
40 MR. ENINGOWUK: They didn't
41 really bring it up. I think it's usually
42 our own residents from the two villages who
43 do the hunting like that.

44
45 I don't think it's a problem.
46 They were -- they want the -- this is after
47 the machine went kablooey.

48
49 I think my comment was that
50 Shishmaref is not so worried about other --
51 other than Wales hunting moose up there.
52 Because we really don't have a road system

1 that -- to our villages, and I don't think
2 there's that much worry for other people
3 than in Shishmaref and Wales for hunting
4 those moose. I think if it happens I think
5 they'll holler. It will come back to us.

6 So I don't think I have a problem
7 if Toby doesn't have a problem.

8 MR. ANUNGAZUK: We were
9 discussing this. I think if it becomes a
10 problem, it's just we'll ask for residents
11 of 22E only.

12 MS. CROSS: So, what do we have
13 now?
14 Donna?

15 MS. DEWHURST: You're saying you
16 don't want it right now?

17 MR. ANUNGAZUK: Right.

18 MS. DEWHURST: Right now, we
19 basically have just extended the special
20 action through December 31st, the existing
21 special action for Unit 22E through December
22 31st for this year, that's for the special
23 action.

24 MR. ENINGOWUK: So move.

25 MS. CROSS: It's been moved by
Johnson.

MR. ANUNGAZUK: Second.

MS. CROSS: Seconded by Toby.

MR. KOBUK: Question.

MS. CROSS: Question has been
called.

22 All those in favor, signify by
23 saying "aye."

24 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

25 MS. CROSS: All those opposed,
same sign.
Motion carries.

1 MS. DEWHURST: Next question
2 which will probably be simple: Do we want
3 these same regulations to roll over to the
4 proposal for the permanent regulations?

5 MR. ENINGOWUK: As long as the
6 moose population is so low, I think we
7 should stay with this hoping the population
8 will get better and maybe we can come back
9 to more moose in the later seasons. I think
10 Shishmaref and Wales are pretty set on
11 keeping the moose population healthy.
12 That's why they elected to go with the
13 shortened season back to a bull only.

14 MR. ANUNGAZUK: Same thing.

15 MS. CROSS: Do you want to make
16 your motion?

17 MR. ENINGOWUK: I'll move.

18 MS. CROSS: Johnson moved.

19 MR. ANUNGAZUK: Second.

20 MS. CROSS: Seconded by Toby.

21 MS. DEGNAN: Question.

22 MS. CROSS: Question has been
23 called.
24 All those in favor, signify by
25 saying "aye."

26 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

27 MS. CROSS: All opposed, same
28 sign.
29 Motion carries.

30 MS. DEWHURST: The rest, you want
31 to reserve?

32 MS. CROSS: Reserve until
33 tomorrow.
34 So, I don't know if you want go
35 on and should we end the meeting now and
continue tomorrow morning at 8:30?

1 We'll adjourn for tonight and
 2 resume tomorrow morning at 8:30.
 3 (Seward Peninsula Federal
 4 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
 adjourned at 4:40 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

6
Sandra M. Mierop, CRR, RPR, CSR

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

